0 00 01 0806589 7

LAMAR UNIVERSITY-BEAUMONT
[redacted]
0 00 01 0103803 2

Trei

Treitschke's History of Germany in the nineteenth

DD
203
T8
1915a
vol.7

Treitschke

History of Germany
in the nineteenth century

LIBRARY OF
LAMAR STATE COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY
↑ 947586

DISCARDED

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/treitschkeshisto0007hein

DISCARDED

HISTORY OF GERMANY IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

TREITSCHKE'S HISTORY OF GERMANY IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

TRANSLATED BY EDEN & CEDAR PAUL

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY
WILLIAM HARBUTT DAWSON

VOLUME SEVEN

LIBRARY OF
LAMAR STATE COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY

947586

LONDON
JARROLD & SONS, WARWICK LANE
G. ALLEN & UNWIN, LTD., MUSEUM ST.
1919

DD
203
T8
1915a
vol. 7

LIBRARY OF
LAMAR STATE COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY

INTRODUCTION.

THE concluding volume of this, the first English translation of Treitschke's "German History in the Nineteenth Century," has been called "Portents of Revolution." The title may not be the historian's, but it is altogether apposite, for it accurately focuses the interest of these closing chapters. The volume, of course, contains much more than reflections upon the imminent political upheaval of Germany. There is an interesting, if unduly detailed, account of the Protestant Frederick William IV's grotesque flirtations with Roman Catholicism and of his meddling in the internal affairs of the Prussian Evangelical Church; the literature, art, science, and philosophy of the period are surveyed; the development of the Customs Union and the railways is followed further; there is an account of the opening struggle between the Protectionists and the Free Traders; and we are reminded that German political circles had already begun to talk of colonies and a navy—aspirations which left the mass of the people cold and unmoved. All these subjects, however, are subsidiary to one engrossing topic, the climax of a long-drawn-out struggle for political liberty.

Portents of revolution had been visible on every hand in Germany from the beginning of the forties. Not only so, but the obstinate defenders of the autocracies and semi-autocracies both saw the signs and understood them. This was true in an especial manner of Frederick William IV of Prussia, whose unbending opposition to democratic reform played directly into the hands of the extremists. He had only been three years on the throne when he declared that he did not regard as legally binding the law of May 22, 1815, wherein his father promised a national assembly with its seat in Berlin; for its author having repudiated this pledge, why should not he? With this declaration he supposed that the constitutional question was settled and done with.

Finding, however, that a merely negative policy produced only irritation and bitterness, he determined at last to convene

a joint assembly of the provincial diets. Before doing this he went to the worst of all possible counsellors, Metternich, who shrewdly warned him that if he summoned to Berlin deputies of the provinces he might find them returning home as deputies of the nation. The king had no fear of such a prospect. He was determined to resist any innovation in the nature of a national parliament, and when he issued his Patent of February 3, 1847, for the creation of "representative institutions" he would not allow them to be publicly spoken of as "chambers," or their members as "popular representatives." The provincial diets were to assemble as a United Diet, which was to be allowed to vote new or increased taxation, and, at his pleasure, to discuss but not decide upon legislative proposals. The United Diet met two months later in a mood of hope which proved of short duration, for the king promptly warned the delegates that if they expected a constitution they were mistaken; he would never, he said, allow a "written paper" to interpose between "our Lord God in heaven and this land in order by its paragraphs to govern us and to replace the sacred fidelity of old." For a long time he refused to assent to periodical sessions of the Diet, though in the end he was compelled to capitulate upon this point. It was then too late to save either his own dignity or his country's peace. On February 22, 1848, the Paris revolution broke out, and in a few weeks all Germany was aflame.

It is Treitschke's opinion that, even granting that the absolute power of the German rulers was ripe for destruction, the transition to a new order might have been compassed peaceably if only the two principal German States, Prussia and Bavaria, had been ruled by men of greater sagacity. Had concessions been made in good time, and above all in a generous spirit, it is possible that the uprising of 1848 might have been averted. But this is just what the rulers of the day refused to recognize, and when the patience of their peoples had once become exhausted compromise was no longer possible. As early as 1845 one of Metternich's agents in Leipzig reported: "Everything here is ripe for revolution, and no one is prepared to accept conciliation." The roots of the tragedy of 1848 were the folly, supineness, and obstinacy of the princes, who saw that trouble was coming, but refused to take warning.

The situation had indeed become desperate when an ardent patriot like Emanuel Geibel, the poet who wrote, and doubtless believed, that "through the German character the world will be made whole," had now to admit that "Germany is sick unto death, and must be blooded." Long before this a moderate man like the historian Niebuhr, while lauding the past utility of unlimited monarchy, had declared his conviction that it was no longer sustained by popular faith, or conformable to the conditions and needs of the time. He was only one of many contemporary representatives of learning who took sides, for or against, on the burning question of constitutional reform. It was at this time that the German professor made his first systematic appearance in political controversy. The constitutional movement and the first Schleswig-Holstein dispute of 1846–50 together drew many occupants of chairs of history in particular into public life, and from that time forward until the present day the German professor has continued to divide his interest between the study and the political arena. The Frankfort National Assembly of 1848–9 was so liberally leavened by academic teachers that it has ever since been known as the "Professors' Parliament." The national unity movement in all its later phases owed much to these men; and they were largely represented in the early Diets of the new Empire.

Incidentally Treitschke gives due prominence to the fact, which is often ignored, that social conditions contributed largely to the political unrest of those days. He has much to say that is true and pertinent about the misery of the German working classes incidental to the introduction of industrialism. As in England, labour was for a long time mercilessly exploited by the new race of manufacturers; wages seldom exceeded a bare subsistence level; the workers were refused the right to combine; and the patriarchal concern of the State for its weaker members had decayed, even in Prussia, where it had been a tradition of long standing. At that time the toiling masses formed an underworld to whose condition the rest of society paid little or no heed. "In Germany, too," Treitschke says truly, "the new age and King Steam made their entry over corpses. If the political dissatisfaction of the cultured classes and the social discontent of the poor were but to join power, the old order would inevitably be swept away." It was inevitable that labour should have

lent a willing ear to communistic and revolutionary propaganda even before Marx and his friend Engels drew up the famous manifesto of 1848, with its powerful appeal: "Proletarians of all countries, unite!"

Nevertheless, it is true, as Treitschke says, that at the time of which he writes "the German world still believed in ideals." This fact is the great tragedy of German political history. Germany was now at the parting of the ways; she stood before the most momentous choice of her history, and the question which had to be decided was whether she should now go forward consciously and resolutely as a standard-bearer of intellectual and political progress, or fall back still further into the morass of stagnation and obscurantism. Left to themselves the German peoples would unquestionably have chosen the worthier and safer alternative. The attempt was indeed made, but it failed; the power of autocracy proved still too strong to be broken, and the democratic movement was beaten back, never again to reassert itself successfully until seventy years later, when the entire stock of Germany's petty despotisms perished amid world-convulsions which brought to destruction much else that was unsound and undeserving of life.

Here, on the eve of convulsive and epoch-making events, the History stops. For it remained an unfinished work—a building which had already, indeed, attained to a quite imposing elevation, yet which might have grown into almost indefinite proportions had life and mental vigour been continued to Treitschke for his task. From his standpoint it was a cruel irony that he had to lay aside his pen just when he had sharpened it for the story of 1848. The revolution would have afforded unique opportunities for the exercise of his varied gifts as a writer. He would have told the story vigorously and dramatically, sparing no reputation. How the vials of his wrath and indignation would have overwhelmed the Governments of that day which could not govern, the bureaucrats who allowed themselves to be carried away with the current, the middle classes which failed to rise to the occasion and assert themselves, and the populace which had the "impudence" to triumph over royalty for one brief hour of glorious life! What a picture he would have drawn of the weak ruler, Frederick William IV, surrendering to clamour the rights which he had refused to reason, masquerading in

the ludicrous carnival jest of March 20th, when he perambulated the streets of Berlin haranguing the mob on imperial unity, and proclaiming that "this day Prussia is absorbed in Germany," or two days later doing homage to the "martyrs of the revolution," as their corpses were borne before the windows of his castle!

That inimitable Chief President of Brandenburg, too, who issued to the population a decree with the sublime preamble: "A revolution has broken out in Berlin: I place myself above parties!"—what an object for the mordant satire of this master of gibes and flouts and sneers!

Treitschke would certainly have written the history of the revolutionary epoch as no other German could have done it, but it would not have been impartial history. It would have been a counterfeit, and we know of what sort. In spite of his clear recognition of the fact that the short-sighted rulers who were responsible for Germany's disunity and weakness were also responsible for the disorder and chaos of those years, and that better days could only come to Germany after she had gone through worse, it is certain that his attitude towards the revolutionary movements would have been one of violent and indiscriminate condemnation. He who so seldom said a generous or unambiguous word for liberty would have seen in these movements only orgies of baseness and crime, while the real culprits would have been whitewashed, and the succeeding reaction would have been lauded as part of the divine order of things.

In the first of these Introductions something was said of the purpose and content of this History. To know what Treitschke's masterpiece is, however, is to recognise what it is not. It is part of a drama of national life, many-sided and full of living incident, a story written with great vigour, eloquence, and enthusiasm, often brilliant, never dull, marked by much powerful characterisation, and rich in sagacious reflection. But it is intensely subjective, abounding in prejudice and perverted judgments, and marred not seldom by perverted taste. For, as he frankly says, Treitschke wrote for Germans, and his object was to strengthen the consciousness and pride of a nation which had been newly born and was not as yet sure of itself. Unquestionably the object was achieved, and achieved in a dangerous degree. In the History the Germans saw themselves idealised, their achievements

magnified, their importance and place in the world and the community of nations distorted and thrown out of balance. That was a great misfortune, as later years were to show. Perhaps more than any other man Treitschke is responsible for the excessive egoism, the self-glorification, boastfulness, and inflated estimate of itself which have been the bane of the German nation ever since 1871, and never so much as during the last twenty years, during which a generation nurtured on Treitschke's dangerous doctrines, promulgated as university teacher, publicist, and historian, has grown up and come into influence and power, both in the State service and in society at large. Germans know this, though for well-understood reasons they are unwilling just now to admit it.

It is amusing to find Treitschke writing in the present volume, "The first duty of every publicist worthy of the name is to put himself in the place of those upon whose actions he is commenting." This excellent, though self-evident, rule no man disregarded more systematically and outrageously than Treitschke, whose inability or unwillingness to judge either men or events impartially, when scientific accuracy and patriotism were in conflict, is a blot upon his reputation as a historian which his merits, many and great as they are, cannot redeem. This defect is seen not only in the treatment of other countries, but in his attitude towards his own countrymen. Thus in the otherwise very readable estimate of the intellectual currents incidental to the pre-revolutionary epoch in Germany which will be found in the following pages his bias and bigotry run riot. No literary personality of the time comes in for harsher judgment than Heine, to whom he does not even try to be just. Assuredly Heine wrote and said many things which could not be palatable to patriotic Germans, yet no man had a clearer understanding of the political evils from which Germany, and Prussia in particular, suffered, or a surer discernment of the disaster towards which his country was being rushed by incompetent rulers and servile statesmen. If he hated Prussia—"You must either drown it or burn it," he wrote—it was not without cause, for independently of the personal humiliations which he suffered at the hands of her masters, he saw in the hard, obstinate, reactionary policy of the Hohenzollern kingdom the seat of Germany's misfortune. How true was his trenchant prophecy, addressed to Prussia in 1844, "The heavy helmet

of the Middle Ages may hinder you when you have to run for it!"—words to which the Armistice of November 11, 1918, gave a point and significance which will be remembered for all time.

To-day all the world can see that it has been a calamity for Germany that the historian who encouraged in his countrymen disregard for the interests and rights of other countries, contempt for alien psychology, and a fatal disposition to place Germany "before everything else in the world" should have been enthroned as a supreme national hero. Let it be admitted that "German History in the Nineteenth Century," in spite of its brilliancy of narration, has not proved an unmixed blessing for the nation for whose greater glory it was written. Plato would have excluded Homer from the republic of his imagination because he represented the gods falsely and in a light hostile to reason and true morality. It would be a happy omen for Germany and for Europe if popular heroes like Bismarck and Treitschke were similarly excluded, if only for a time, from the Valhalla of the Republic which is now being created at Weimar. The influence of both men, each in his way, has been evil. Both preached the vicious doctrine of force; both perverted the national mind in the service of a narrow, false, ungenerous patriotism; both helped the State to usurp functions and powers which could not safely belong to it, and which it exercised to the hurt first of Germany and ultimately of all mankind; both taught the nation to pursue aims and ambitions which were destined to lead it out of the right course and in the end to overwhelm it in disaster.

To suggest any such act of self-abnegation is, of course, unpractical. That the History in particular will ever forfeit its high place in the estimate of the German people is not to be expected. Long ago it passed into the life of the nation, and its position there is beyond challenge. It is more likely that the very calamity into which the Germans have been led will cause them to turn more than ever to its pages for solace and encouragement. Nor will that be a misfortune if henceforth they read their country's modern history with seeing eyes and understanding minds, regarding it as merely a part and not the whole, still less the end, of all history; allowing for other points of view and giving to other interests equal consideration with their own;

applying to themselves more readily the critical spirit which their favourite historian applies so remorselessly to the non-German world; in a word, remembering that the life of any nation is part of the life of every nation, and that no nation can follow a policy of systematic egoism without loss to itself and the entire human fellowship. These, however, are duties incumbent on all peoples alike, and the impartial moralist may be disposed to say, "Let him that is without sin cast the first stone!"

WILLIAM HARBUTT DAWSON.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

VOL. VII. BOOK FIVE (*continued*).

KING FREDERICK WILLIAM IV.

1840–1848.

CHAPTER PAGE

IV. THE PARTIES IN THE CHURCH

§1. Reconciliation of Prussia with the Vatican - 3
§2. The Abel Ministry and the Blittersdorf Ministry 39
§3. German Catholicism - - - - 77
§4. Old Lutherans and Free Congregations - - 95
§5. The First Prussian General Synod - - 110

V. REALISM IN ART AND SCIENCE

§1. Political Poetry - - - - - 121
§2. Romance and Drama - - - - 138
§3. The Fine Arts - - - - - 153
§4. Historians and Political Theorists - - 169
§5. The New Natural Science - - - 189

VI. GROWTH AND DECAY OF POLITICAL ECONOMY

§1. Expansion of the Customs Union. Luxemburg, Brunswick - - - - 200
§2. The Struggle between Protection and Free Trade 219
§3. Railways and the Money Power. Social Unrest 277

VII. POLAND AND SCHLESWIG-HOLSTEIN

§1. The European Situation after the Straits Convention - - - - 316
§2. Risings in Poland. Annexation of Cracow - 336
§3. The Open Letter. The Revolt of Schleswig-Holstein - - - - - 366

VIII. THE UNITED DIET

§1. The Constitutionalist Movement. The Patent 400
§2. The United Diets and their Committee - - 431

CHAPTER PAGE

IX. DECLINE OF THE GERMANIC FEDERATION

§1. Decay of Monarchical Authority in the Middle-sized States - - - - - 474

§2. Congresses of Savants. Prussia's Plans for Federal Reform - - - - 518

X. PRECURSORS OF THE EUROPEAN REVOLUTION

§1. Disintegration of the Alliances. Austria and Italy - - - - - - 541

§2. The Sonderbund War. Prussia and Neuchâtel 570

APPENDIXES TO VOL. VII.

XXXIII. Count Brühl's Negotiations in Rome - - 592

XXXIV. The Legend of Heine the Refugee - - 595

XXXV. List to King Frederick William - - 598

XXXVI. Count Christian Bernstorff and Schleswig-Holstein - - - - 600

XXXVII. The Prince of Prussia and the Constitutional Plans - - - - - 603

XXXVIII. Kühne to Bodelschwingh - - - 610

XXXIX. Memoirs of Prince Emilius of Hesse - - 612

INDEX - - - - - - - 616

VOL. VII.

BOOK V. (*continued*).

KING FREDERICK WILLIAM IV.

1840-1848.

CHAPTER IV.

THE PARTIES IN THE CHURCH.

§ I. RECONCILIATION OF PRUSSIA WITH THE VATICAN.

THERE is nothing in history more enigmatic than the religious life of the highly cultured nations, those nations which have long ceased to possess a frank sense of unity, have long forfeited a vigorous realisation of kinship between the heights and the depths of society. It sometimes happens, in the case of such nations, that all fear of God, all devoutness, seems to have vanished from cultured circles, until, of a sudden, unsuspected forces of joyful faith or of foolish superstition surge up from the masses of the people; sometimes, on the other hand, in an essentially unbelieving or indifferent generation, there will occur clamorous religious disputes about which the populace is in truth little concerned. Such an epoch, devoid of the ardour of faith and nevertheless filled with religious contentions, had now dawned for the Germans. During these eight years, a full third of the new literary matter that issued from the press was devoted to religious polemic, and yet the interests of the great majority of the cultured classes were predominantly secular. Few traces could now be discerned of the profound religious faith of the wars of liberation, and that faith was only to reawaken as a result of the shattering experiences of the revolutionary years. The ultramontanes alone constituted a well-defined ecclesiastical party, but their aims were essentially political, and they owed their new power to the struggle against the Prussian crown. Nitzsch and many other disciples of Schleiermacher cherished purely ecclesiastical ideas of reform, and among their contemporaries, whose thoughts were now concentrated upon political activity, these ideas found little acceptance. Even the radical movement in religion, though

LIBRARY OF
LAMAR STATE COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY

it led to numerous unsuccessful attempts at the formation of new sects, lacked popular support, for the common people had never concerned themselves with the disputes among the philosophical schools; it was rarely the outcome of an earnest moral conviction; in many cases it was no more than a natural reaction against the growing arrogance of the ultramontanes or against the strictly religious attitude of the Prussian government; but in the majority of instances it served the political opposition as a mask for secular aims. Never since the decline of the old enlightenment had Germany been so devoid of fruitful religious ideas as during this decade of unceasing religious strife.

It was by a tragical destiny that in such an age Frederick William should be led to attempt the realisation of his ideal of a Christian state. His first desire was for reconciliation with the pope. Long ere this he had constructed for himself a charming fancy picture of the Roman church, outbidding in his self-deception the current delusions of the devout Protestants of our north-eastern provinces. It was his firm conviction that since the peace of Westphalia the parity of religions in Germany had been honestly recognised by all parties, for he ignored the universally known fact that the Roman see had again and again formally condemned the peace in question. He considered that at the high level to which popular culture had now attained, any serious breach of religious peace had become impossible, although the curia, in the dispute concerning mixed marriages, had just shown unambiguously that now as of old Rome looked upon Protestants as unclean heretics. It seemed to him inconceivable that the Roman clergy should ever relapse into the secularisation of earlier days, and yet the French clericalists were already prophesying, in words destined to literal fulfilment, that their church which had been plundered by the revolution was in a single century to acquire more wealth than she had won for herself in the previous sixteen hundred years. Miracles, pilgrimages, and the display of relics, were regarded by the king as no more than outworn abuses which the Catholic church would speedily relinquish, and his confidence seemed undisturbed by the obvious and continuous increase in these practices. For the bishops, finally, he cherished profound though tacit veneration, for it was with him an article of faith that by the mystical consecration of the laying-on of hands their sacred office had passed down

in direct succession from the apostles. Thus with innocent credulity did he enter into the episcopal dispute, determining, since there was in truth no other way out of the difficulty, to treat directly with the Vatican.

When he ascended the throne, fully half of the Prussian bishoprics were in evil case, and relief could only come from an understanding between the secular and the religious authorities. Droste-Vischering and Dunin were still kept away from their dioceses. In Treves, Arnoldi had been elected bishop by the chapter, but the late king had refused to approve the election, which was indubitably illegal. In Breslau, Sedlnitzky had loyally conformed to the laws of the state, and the prince bishop had consequently been commanded by the pope to relinquish his office; it was still open to the crown to defend the trusty prelate against this abuse of authority. These numerous grounds of contention might have been turned to good account by the state, had Prussia been careful to keep all her cards in her hands, and to remember the old truth that those who have to deal with the tenacious and obstinate Roman see must invariably demand cash payments. But to Frederick William the chaffering of the market was repulsive. In royal mood, he proposed to display his magnanimity by a free gift to the curia, a gift that would manifest his benevolent intentions towards the Roman church. Before the negotiations had actually begun; he restored their archbishop to his beloved Poles; and a few days later, unwillingly enough, he approved Sedlnitzky's resignation. Thus of the four questions demanding settlement, two were in advance decided in Rome's favour.

In June, 1840, the office of negotiator was conferred upon Lieutenant-Colonel Count Brühl. A man of amiable manners, full of common sense, and likely to inspire confidence, Brühl, a friend of the king's youth, was as yet without experience in diplomatic affairs. He was a good Catholic, but by no means an ultramontane; he had long been on friendly terms with the gentle Bishop Sedlnitzky; his wife, a daughter of Gneisenau, was a Protestant, and Brühl had permitted his own daughter to be brought up in the mother's faith. During the late king's lifetime, Sedlnitzky, moved thereto by Wittgenstein, had asked Brühl whether he would like to accompany the invalid Prince Henry to Rome as aide-de-camp, where he could initiate private negotiations with the Vatican. At that

time the count refused the offer, for the rigid territorialism of Prussian ecclesiastical policy was no less repugnant to him than were the fanatical protestations of the curia. "Altenstein and his adherents," wrote Brühl, "are on a par with Lambruschini and his clique."[1] Now, however, that the offer was renewed, Brühl did not hesitate to accept the commission. He felt unable to refuse his royal friend's appeal, and under the new ruler there seemed hope of success in the negotiations. His instructions were that in Rome at the outset he was to make no definite offers, but was to give the curia a solemn assurance that the king wished to concede all possible freedoms to the Roman church in Prussia. He was to ask, "as a first proof of good will," that the pope should summon the archbishop of Cologne away from Germany, perhaps making him a cardinal, and should then join with the crown in the definitive ordering of affairs in the orphaned bishopric;[2] should the Roman see prove utterly unconciliatory, Prussia would be compelled to come to terms with England and the other Protestant powers for the adoption of a joint ecclesiastical policy. In truth, the menace was perfectly futile, for everyone knew that the London court would never move a finger unless it believed its own interests to be threatened. When the Prussian envoy addressed an enquiry to Palmerston, the latter's reply was friendly but entirely non-committal.[3]

After Dunin's return, everyone expected that Droste-Vischering would likewise be reinstated, and no one hoped this more confidently than the elderly archbishop himself. Rebuffed by Minister Rochow, Droste-Vischering rejoined in his abominable German that his hopes were unshaken, for these hopes, he said, "rest upon the sublime sentiments of his majesty." He had already ordered carriage and horses for a triumphal entry into his metropolitanate.[4] His adherents on the Rhine overwhelmed the monarch with pathetic petitions, but not all of them were so courageous as the nun Martin, manufacturer of the renowned eau-de-Cologne, who did not hesitate to appeal openly to the blessed memory of her benefactor the deceased

[1] Sedlnitzky to Brühl, February 20 and 21, 1840; Brühl's Comments.

[2] Werther's Instructions to Brühl, July 10 and 22; to Buch, July 22, 1840. (See Appendix XXXIII).

[3] Bülow's Report, London, August 16; Werther's Report to the king, August 26, 1840.

[4] Rochow to Lottum, August 6; Droste-Vischering to Vincke, August 14, 1840.

king. Many who were asked to sign the petition, whilst declaring their sympathy, said that they must withhold their signatures for the present, "from dread of their opponents." [1] Though the question was a political one, a question of rival powers, Frederick William adjudged it sentimentally, not as a statesman but as a good son. Dunin had been duly sentenced by a law-court, and could therefore be pardoned without further ado. Droste, on the other hand, had begun the whole quarrel, and had then, without sentence of the court and without legal proceedings, been compelled to leave his bishopric upon the direct order of the late monarch. To the new king it would have seemed a breach of filial piety to rescind his father's command; and since the ministers, too, were united in taking an unwarrantably milder view of the Poles than of the Westphalians, Brühl had to declare from the first that Droste could never be allowed to resume office, and that only upon this understanding had Dunin been pardoned. Fortunately Frederick William's sentimental policy was closely accordant with the sober calculations of the Vatican. The cardinals, herein more sagacious than the Prussian government, had always regarded the Cologne fanatic as a tiresome German zealot; now, through his martyrdom, he had become useful to the church, and he could only remain useful by remaining a martyr. In no other respect could his services be turned to account, for during the three years of this exile the rudeness and the quarrelsome self-conceit of this prelate, whose health was poor, had risen to an insufferable pitch. Long ago, therefore, the tacit determination had been formed that, when articles of peace were signed, the trusty Westphalian should, with Vatican phlegm, be made the scapegoat. First of all, however, it was needful that the state authority should once more be thoroughly humiliated.

When Count Brühl opened the negotiations on August 20th, his reception was not positively hostile, but the cardinal secretary of state displayed the arrogance of the conqueror. In fierce harangues, wherein the Prussian could at times detect a theatrically forced note, Lambruschini thundered against the loyal chapter of Cologne, against the Hermesians, and above all against Bunsen. As regards the last named, Brühl, after examining the documents, was fain to admit

[1] Petitions to the king: from the burghers of Düsseldorf, January 30; from the nun Martin, November 17, 1841; etc.

that "the man had not been straight." Cardinal Capaccini, a man of more benign disposition than his colleague, acknowledged in confidence that Droste was wholly unfitted for the governance of the archbishopric; yet even he was of opinion that the expelled prelate must be formally reinstated. Afterwards, said Capaccini, the archbishop could perhaps be given his congé on the ground of age, and be presented with a cardinal's hat. The monsignori were at no loss for pretexts. Now they would say that the chapter ought to be disciplined for having abandoned its bishop; now that the Catholic press demanded this atonement; now, again, that the holy see owed satisfaction to the much injured episcopate, which in truth was everywhere, and even in America, following the Prussian ecclesiastical dispute with due close attention, so that numerous consolatory epistles had been sent to the martyr in Münster. The aim was obvious. The heretic king was to abase himself in the dust before the recalcitrant bishop, quite as this latter had demanded two years earlier.[1] Equally fruitless was a visit to the shady mountain abode of Castel Gandolfo, where the pope was wont to pass the summer months. Gregory never emerged from his monastic circle of ideas. He knew even less of politics than did Lambruschini, for he read but a single newspaper *l'Universo*, a rigidly clericalist organ, and believed every word therein contained. He treated the envoy with fatherly benevolence, and referred gratefully to the king's magnanimous sentiments. Yet again and again the old monkish hatred for infidel Germany became manifest; again and again he insisted, "the pope cannot do that!" Gregory always spoke of "the pope" as of some higher being who had no connection with his own personality, and when German Protestants or Orthodox Russians would assure him that Rome was unique, it was his custom to answer: "Enter, my beloved children; why do you remain outside?" After three harassing weeks, Brühl started home again, having achieved nothing, but firmly convinced that the Vatican itself desired to get rid of the Westphalian mischief-maker as decorously as possible.[2]

His intuition did not deceive him. Shortly afterwards Wilhelm Schadow likewise returned from a pilgrimage to Rome. The renowned director of the Düsseldorf academy of arts had become a Catholic many years earlier, and had, after the

[1] See vol. VI, p. 263.

[2] Brühl's Reports, Rome, August 20 to September 5, 1840.

manner of converts, adopted ultraclericalist views. In Rome Schadow had had an interview with Capaccini, and now, at the cardinal's instigation, proposed to treat confidentially with Droste should the king grant permission. Frederick William approved the remarkable proposal, which was made to him through the instrumentality of General Gröben, but added for his part the definite instruction that Droste was not to return to Cologne, and must rest content if the pope were to appoint him coadjutor for life.[1] Accompanied by Count Fürstenberg-Stammheim, one of the spokesmen of the ultramontane nobles of Rhineland, Schadow journeyed to Münster at Christmas, with a result which any intelligent person might have foreseen. Filled with veneration for the great martyr, the two clericalist envoys did not even venture to expound the king's proposals. All that they did was humbly to listen to what the offended prelate had to say as to his own wishes, and they naïvely reported that Droste demanded unconditional reinstatement, though subsequently, when a suitable opportunity should occur, he purposed to withdraw from Cologne. Displaying an artist's simplicity in political affairs, Schadow added that it seemed extremely desirable to have a nuncio accredited to the Bundestag. Under the protection of Austria this emissary could act as leader of the German church. Prussia need then merely have a chargé d'affaires in Rome to deal with current affairs. It was true that this would "in a sense create a state within the state," but since all saving grace must issue from the Catholic church, the blessings that would accrue would prove advantageous to noncatholics as well! Even to the goodnatured monarch this "seasonable gift" had a sinister aspect, and he wrote in melancholy mood: "The spirit which permeates the whole disheartens me, not because I recognise what I have long known that the two messengers are confirmed papists, but because the whole business has now become clear to me, and has perhaps been mitigated to the utmost possible degree by Capaccini, who is the gentlest and most yielding member of the papal entourage.[2]

Meanwhile, however, it had begun to dawn upon the Vatican that it was inexpedient to play with a powerful crown

[1] Gröben's Report to the king, October 28; Thile's account of the king's commands, November 5, 1840.

[2] Reports from Fürstenberg and Schadow, January 2; from Gröben, January 3; King Frederick William to Thile, January 8, 1841.

in this manner. A fresh negotiator, Count Reisach, bishop of Eichstädt, was commissioned by the pope to visit Droste in February, 1841. The name of the new envoy was not one to carry promise of good. Reisach was the worldly-wise leader of the Jesuit party in Bavaria, and lived up to the reputation for craft and astuteness which had clung to his house since Napoleonic days. During his tenure of the episcopal office, the charming little city in the peaceful mountain valley of the Altmühl had become a miniature Bavarian Rome. In the ancient cathedral was the tomb of St. Wilibald, whilst in the church upon the adjacent Wilibaldsburg the miraculous oil of St. Walpurga oozed from the rocks. Here there occurred as many miracles as the heart of man could desire, and once again as in the days of the Bavarian concordat there assembled in the stately episcopal palace an Eichstädt league of trusty ultramontanes.[1] In the priestly circles of Munich it was universally reported, doubtless with good reason, that five years earlier, in private conversation over a pipe, Reisach had been the first to encourage the archbishop of Cologne to enter into conflict with the crown. Now this man was to be the mediator! The Bavarian prelate took advantage of his stay in Münster to win over for the priesthood Wilhelm von Ketteler, a young man who had recently left the Prussian state service. But with Droste, Reisach could do nothing. The stubborn old fellow would not hear a word of renouncing his claims; neither the cardinal's purple nor life in Rome offered him any charms. To the uninitiated it remained obscure whether Reisach had on his own account deliberately embroiled the negotiations, or whether instructions from Rome had induced him to keep matters in suspense.

However this might be, such secret machinations seemed to indicate that the Roman see did not wish to remain wholly unyielding. In December, 1840, therefore, Count Brühl was sent to Rome for a second time. On this occasion he appeared with full hands, for he was able to bring the Vatican the joyful tidings that the king had decided upon his own initiative to permit free intercourse between the bishops and the pope, to restrict the royal right of the placet, and to establish a catholic department in the ministry of public worship and education. Since both on the Rhine and in Posen the state authority had already yielded ground, and since it was impossible

[1] See vol. II, p. 651.

to have a twofold ecclesiastical law in Prussia, henceforward throughout the monarchy mixed marriages were to be regulated in accordance with the notorious papal brief and in accordance with the discretion of the bishop.[1] Frederick William was even prepared to grant to the bishoprics of the east the more liberal right of election which the cathedral chapters of the west had secured through the episcopal areas' bull, although in the east the crown had hitherto alone nominated the bishops. Finally, it was an obvious deduction from earlier declarations that the state would show no favour to the Hermesians. Taking it all in all, therefore, it might be said that the king had not come to meet the wishes of the Vatican, but had anticipated these wishes. Only one concession was demanded in return for all these voluntary gifts. "Upon one point alone do we stand firm," wrote Eichhorn; "on no account can the archbishop return to Cologne, were it only to peep for a minute through the gate of the city!"[2] Brühl's first journey had for a time been kept secret from the world. But by now it had become a matter of notoriety, and the friendly court of Turin offered to mediate, suggesting, in conformity with King Charles Albert's clericalist principles, that Droste should resume office for a brief period and then resign. The intermediation was declined with thanks.[3] Frederick William had begun this undertaking single handed, and was resolute to end it in the same fashion.

The opponents, however, were likewise making ready for the fray. Bishop Laurens and the Jesuits did their utmost to frustrate the possibilities of reconciliation; Jarcke came from Vienna, Guido Görres from Munich.[4] Active, too, in the compaign against Prussia was Frau von Kimsky, the somnambulist, who had in former days befooled the aging Hardenberg with her hocus-pocus arts, and subsequently, satiated with the pleasures of this world, had taken refuge in the bosom of the Roman church. Pope Gregory seriously believed her to be a saint, for in truth the sometime Camaldolite monk had had scant opportunity of becoming acquainted with respectable women. Once again, therefore, innumerable intrigues

[1] Ladenberg, Memorial concerning mixed marriages, September 1, 1840.

[2] Eichhorn to Thile, January 12, 1841.

[3] Truchsess-Waldburg, Report from Turin, October 12; Werther's Report to the king, October 25, 1840.

[4] Major von Moliere, aide-de-camp of Prince Henry, to Brühl, May 18, 1841.

went on in the celebrated "chamber of lies" of the Vatican, the chamber concerning which the free thinkers of the cinquecento had been accustomed to sharpen their wits. The pope vacillated aimlessly, and the gentle Capaccini often said despairingly to Brühl: "I wonder who has been working upon him this time!" It was impossible to ascertain the precise nature of the intrigues of Count Lützow, the Austrian envoy, but this bigoted convert was unlikely to employ his influence in Prussia's favour. From a distance the king's step-aunt, Duchess Julia of Coethen, did what she could to counteract her nephew's plans, being ably assisted by her Jesuit hangers-on. Meanwhile the provincial diets of Rhineland and Westphalia made themselves heard, the strings being doubtless pulled from Rome. In both these assemblies a proposal in favour of Droste's reinstatement was ultimately outvoted. In Münster, all the knights and one peasant voted aye; but all the nobles and gentry, and all the representatives of the towns and rural communes, with one exception, were adverse. But how impudent was the language of the strengthened ultramontane party. In the diet at Münster, Count Westphalen said: "I adjure my co-estates not to give a tacit sanction, as if it were merely necessary to supply a silken cord for the moral suicide of a burgher who had incurred the displeasure of the government"; and when his loyal fellow-countrymen protested against this jacobin tone, he arrogantly declared that when he spoke of a silken cord he had had no intention of casting a slur upon the late king. Shortly afterwards he left Prussia, finding it impossible to justify himself to the crown.

Thus unfavourable were the auspices when Count Brühl reopened the negotiations, which continued for five and a half months, until May, 1841. The great concessions freely made by the king had to some extent smoothed the envoy's path. The very cardinals were now willing to admit that the mulish old archbishop, whose company was shunned even by his own bigoted family, could work nothing but harm in Cologne. Brühl therefore enquired whether the pope, in understanding with the crown, could not immediately appoint a coadjutor who would be competent to succeed Droste—an expedient which had already been suggested to the king shortly after his accession by Ferdinand Walter, a loyal clericalist of Bonn. Gregory approved the idea, for in this wise the detested chapter

of Cologne would be wholly ignored. Next, following the usual custom of the Vatican, there ensued a process of cautious research for a possible candidate. After numerous shifts, Lambruschini suggested Reisach, the Jesuit leader; next, Professor Kellermann of Münster, an intimate of the Droste family; and finally young Canon Windischmann of Munich, son of Carl Windischmann, the Bonn physician and philosopher. Friedrich Windischmann was an able orientalist, much more the man of learning than the priest, but he was a member of the ultra Jesuit party, and wrote for Görres' Catholic periodical. Brühl rejected all three nominees as impossible. His king, he said, would be pleased by the appointment of Diepenbrock, dean of Ratisbon, a man of noble birth and high culture; but this suggestion was vetoed by the curia. No doubt it might in the end have proved possible to come to terms upon the question of nominee, since each party still had a candidate in reserve. A deadlock arose, however, concerning the question of Droste's return to Cologne. "Never!" declared Brühl. "For a few days only!" was the demand of the monsignori, although they themselves admitted that this return would stir up the Rhinelanders, and could not fail to embitter the Protestants of the old provinces. Meanwhile addresses came to hand from the faithful on the Rhine, beseeching the holy father to bring about the return of their archbishop. Droste, too, wrote "in his peculiarly impolite manner" (as Capaccini phrased it), saying that the cardinal's purple was naught to him, and that all he wanted was satisfaction. It would go ill with the church, he declared, if the pope were to allow the bishops to suffer such grievous wrong.

Brühl stuck to his guns, and amid these interminable shufflings he came to realise how accurately the Romans appraised the nature of the theocracy in their blunt saying, "It is impossible to treat with priests." Yielding ground by imperceptible degrees, after long months the curia at length arrived at the counterproposal that Droste should return to Cologne for no more than four-and-twenty hours, and not to instal the coadjutor, but simply in order that as "envoyé du pape" he might invest with the episcopal dignity the man who had been appointed coadjutor. This was stated to be the utmost possible concession, and the proposal clearly showed that it was no longer a question of maintaining the rights

of the church, but of the deliberate humiliation of the Prussian crown. None knew this better than Gregory, the learned canonist; but he assumed so forlorn a pose, and uttered his everlasting "the pope cannot do that" in so heartbreaking a tone, that the excellent Prussian came at last to feel quite remorseful. To German Catholics this priestly despot, whose worthless regime was cursed by all his subjects, was still the holy father. In accordance with his instructions Brühl continued to insist that on no account could the archbishop ever be permitted to resume office. But to Thile he wrote in melancholy mood: "I am no diplomat. . . . I cannot chaffer with the pope. . . . It is impossible for me to go on pestering this noble old man, for my conscience assures me that he is right."[1] For the second time, therefore, he returned home, having achieved nothing.

The king, who had already vacillated more than once during the negotiations, was grieved and surprised. He opined: "The proposals of the Roman see must be maturely considered, *especially with regard to the consequences of my* NEGATIVE." Now came a letter from his uncle Prince Henry, who had for years been an intimate of the Roman world, and by many was regarded, erroneously no doubt, as a secret Catholic. The invalid prince wrote in his cheerful and brilliant style to the effect that it would be the simplest thing in the world were Droste to go to Cologne for a single day, with the obligation to quit immediately thereafter.[2] After much heart-searching the king made up his mind that he would agree to the last suggestion of the Vatican, and would actually permit the Rhenish ultramontanes to hold for a day their triumphal dance over the grave of his father. Droste was to return for the episcopal consecration. Brühl was provided with new instructions, and was for the third time commanded to visit Rome.[3]

The monarch submitted to yet another encroachment on the part of the pope. Hüsgen, vicar-general of Cologne, had died at the end of April. During the difficult years of transition, this excellent man had conducted the provisional administration of the archbishopric to the complete satisfaction

[1] Brühl's Reports, December 26, 1840, to May 1, 1841.

[2] King Frederick William to Thile, May 13; Prince Henry to the king, April 24, 1841.

[3] Thile to Brühl, May 21 and June 22, 1841.

alike of the old monarch and of the new. The chapter now enquired of the lord-lieutenant whether Droste might resume office or might cooperate in the appointment of the new vicar-general. The answer being in the negative, the new election took place in precisely the same manner as in 1837 after Droste's removal, and the appointment as vicar-general of Canon Müller, like his predecessor a worthy and peace-loving priest, was confirmed by the lord-lieutenant. The pope, however, regarded this proceeding as scandalous disobedience, being unwilling to allow the accursed chapter to administer affairs provisionally even during the brief period which would intervene before the approaching settlement, although Gregory had hitherto tolerated this provisional administration. Declaring the election null, he nominated Canon Iven, the only ultramontane in the chapter and the only member who had abstained from voting for Müller's election (thereby securing special commendation from the holy father).[1] Meanwhile, from the ultramontane camp at Würzburg, there was issued a writing composed by Hermann Müller but published anonymously, *The Church of Cologne in May*, 1841, a savage libel promptly suppressed in Prussia on account of its impudent invectives, although by devious paths a copy came into the king's hands. The pope's action was manifestly illegal, for Gregory had not even thought it necessary to notify in advance this monarch who seemed prepared for every concession. The king therefore refused to recognise Iven's election, but intimidated by the threats of the clericalists he sent a confidential assurance to Rome through the instrumentality of Brühl that whilst reserving his sovereign rights he would tacitly tolerate Iven's assumption of office! Thus did he pass from one weakly concession to another.[2]

In the interim another mediator, King Louis of Bavaria, had thrust himself into the negotiations. The Wittelsbach ruler now honestly wished to bring about a reconciliation. In his own fashion he had an affection for his brother-in-law of Berlin, and since there was still imminent danger of war he dreaded anything which might weaken Prussia. But he was influenced above all by the fact that his own policy had put the Bavarian liberals and Protestants into a very ill humour.

[1] Lambruschini to Brühl, May 21; Papal Brief to Iven, May 21, 1841.

[2] King Frederick William to Thile, June 2; Cabinet Order to Eichhorn, July 7; Brühl's Report, July 21, 1841.

He hoped that his work as peacemaker would allay their discontent, but at the same time his trusty minister Abel and the ultramontanes were to secure satisfaction through the settlement. He recommended Bishop Geissel of Spires, for whom he had a peculiar esteem, as coadjutor for the archbishopric, adding that it was impossible for him to give Frederick William a stronger proof of his friendship than his willingness to spare the services of such a man. In all probability he had previously and in confidence made the same proposal to Rome, for Geissel was the reserve candidate of the curia, and as long ago as March, Capaccini, in conversation with Brühl, had tentatively suggested this name. King Frederick William accepted the advice of Louis,[1] and when Count Brühl set out for the third time to Rome he journeyed by way of Munich to discuss details. In a flattering letter King Louis now asked Bishop Geissel to express his willingness to accept the post of coadjutor. Abel supported the monarch's request, and with his customary fanatical bluntness explained in direct terms what the Jesuits expected from the future lord bishop of Cologne. He wrote as follows: "Whilst restoring her rights to the Catholic church of Prussia, you must avail yourself of the repercussion that will inevitably ensue in the other Protestant states of Germany to put an end there also to those revolutionary principles which would transform the august daughter of heaven into the handmaiden of modern statehood, would profane and degrade her." Signs and wonders were indeed rife now that the new ultramontane party had closed its ranks. To whom ere this would it have seemed conceivable that a German minister of state should positively incite a priest to the struggle against the ecclesiastical policy of German governments? For the nonce, Geissel's answer was a guarded refusal, but his ambitious desires readily transpired through the carefully chosen phrases.

On this occasion, after the king's additional and extensive concessions, Brühl was received in Rome with open arms. When he suggested Geissel's appointment, neither Lambruschini nor the pope had any objection to so excellent a nomination. But all at once a new arrow was drawn from the inexhaustible quiver of the crafty Vatican negotiations—a weighty and quite insuperable objection. Geissel was already a bishop, and therefore could not be consecrated bishop by

[1] King Frederick William to Thile, June 2, 1841.

Droste. Consequently, said the monsignori, brazenly ignoring all previous understandings, the inauguration into the coadjutorship must be effected, not by the pope but by Droste, for otherwise the archbishop would not be given the requisite satisfaction. Berlin, however, had provided against any such surprise onslaughts. Brühl absolutely refused to accede to this proposal, and when the curia proved unyielding he suddenly declared that in that case the idea of Geissel's appointment must be dropped, and Prussia would nominate Canon Arnoldi of Treves—the very Arnoldi whom the late king had regarded as a persona minus grata and had therefore refused to accept as bishop of Treves! After brief hesitation, Gregory adopted this new proposal. Other details were speedily settled, and within a few days Brühl was able to report with satisfaction that matters were now irrevocably decided. The pope nominated Arnoldi coadjutor, arranging that the archbishop should go for one day to Cologne, where the episcopal ordination was to take place in accordance with the holy father's instructions. How gross were the contradictions into which the king had been forced by the goodness of his heart. His pious affection for his father's memory had led him to forbid Droste's return, and yet he was now willing that this prelate, whom the late king had expelled for insubordination, should revisit the see for four-and-twenty hours, in order to consecrate as bishop the new coadjutor of Cologne, a man to whom the defunct sovereign had refused to entrust even the modest bishopric of Treves! Did not this involve a double slight upon his father's memory? A shameful defeat confronted the crown of Prussia and the person of its wearer, for precisely inasmuch as the state is power, weakness, even well-intentioned weakness, is the gravest of all political sins.

Droste's obstinacy alone saved Prussia from this scandal. Schadow and Fürstenberg had again exercised their arts of persuasion upon the archbishop, but these arts had again proved unavailing. The unbending Westphalian became more and more of a nuisance to the monsignori, and Capaccini declared it was fortunate that Droste had refused the purple, for had he accepted it he might have been in Rome, and quarrelling with pope and cardinals. Gregory was uneasy, for he knew it to be beyond the pope's competence to impose upon a reluctant bishop a coadjutor with such extended powers. Though utterly regardless of the rights of secular authority,

he was extremely scrupulous in avoiding any infringement of the canon law. He determined, therefore, to send the archbishop an autograph letter expressly urging the recognition of the coadjutor. At the same time he despatched Bishop Reisach for the second time to Münster, on this occasion with the strictest instructions, so that the Bavarian Jesuit would be compelled to use his utmost energies. After some weeks of wearisome disputation, Reisach was at length able to report that Droste had submitted himself completely to the holy father's commands, and would even issue a pastoral letter exhorting his flock to be dutiful towards the coadjutor. But, pleading ill-health, Droste had definitely refused to go to Cologne for the episcopal ordination.[1] It was plain that the German nobleman felt that it would touch his honour, now that he had been contumeliously sacrificed by the Vatican, to participate in this trifling four-and twenty hour clerical farce. Conspicuous from the first scene to the last of this tragicomedy was the contrast between German sincerity and Latin cunning.

Thus involuntarily did the expelled archbishop spare his king from a self-imposed humiliation. But in the Vatican there occurred a fresh change of scene as soon as the news arrived from Münster. Forgotten now were the unctuous speeches wherewith the Prussian envoy had previously been overpersuaded. There was no longer any thought of satisfaction for the injured episcopate, and since Rome desired that the matter should at length be settled, the simplest course seemed to be a return to the choice of Geissel, who did not require to be consecrated bishop. It was known from Reisach's reports that Droste would offer no objection to this course. The cardinal secretary of state made this new swerve with such facility that Brühl's suspicions were aroused, and the count rightly inferred that Geissel's appointment had probably for a considerable period been the one really desired by Lambruschini, Reisach, and the Jesuits. Filled with forebodings, he added that little dependence could be placed upon the judgment of King Louis, who was by no means farsighted and was too much under Catholic influence. But Brühl was bound by his instructions. The negotiations, which had endured for three and a half months, drew speedily to a close, and on September 23rd the appointment of Geissel was formally arranged in a

[1] Brühl's Reports, September 10 and 16, 1841.

secret agreement wherein the earlier pledges of the Prussian crown were reenumerated. Brühl took leave of the pope in Perugia. Gregory, fulfilling a vow, was visiting the shrines of Umbria. He expressed his most cordial thanks to the king and to the envoy, saying that he esteemed himself happy to be now enabled to die in peace.[1]

The court of Munich, which did not learn of the Arnoldi interlude until a late hour, had meanwhile been vigorously at work to persuade the bishop of Spires to accept the office of coadjutor. Geissel, therefore, was not unprepared to receive the enquiry from the holy see, and shortly afterwards the nomination. It was still needful to win over the Cologne chapter, which was loyal to the Prussian state, and this painful duty fell to Bodelschwingh, who was still lord lieutenant. He found most of the chapter in a state of considerable irritation at the invasion of their electoral rights, whilst they were full of alarm regarding the future, for they dreaded lest henceforward they should be ruled in Droste's spirit, but by a young and vigorous man. With difficulty was Bodelschwingh able to appease them by pointing out that although the episcopal areas' bill was in truth a national law, it had been enacted by agreement between the crown and the Roman see, and could therefore be suspended by mutual arrangement. In the end the chapter resolved to comply from a sense of obedience, but without any formal expression of approval.[2] For the king, likewise, an act of self-conquest was requisite. In accordance with the agreement made at Rome, he gave the veteran archbishop a written apology, declaring in this document that the charge of "politico-revolutionary intrigues" formerly made against Droste had proved totally devoid of foundation. The letter was drafted by Eichhorn, but was subsequently much modified by the monarch's own hand. Thile, sending the fair copy to the king for signature on his majesty's birthday, wrote solemnly: "May your majesty please to accept the birthday gift which God vouchsafes to make you in the conclusion of peace with the archbishop, as a splendid announcement of the thoughts of peace which He entertains towards you!"[3]

It was true, peace had been signed, but at what a price! In the Cologne affair, Prussia had secured a partial success,

[1] Brühl's Reports, July 21 to September 25, 1841.
[2] Bodelschwingh's Report to Thile, May 4, 1841.
[3] Thile to King Frederick William, October 15, 1841.

but in all the other pending ecclesiastico-political contentions the state had surrendered unconditionally, doing this even in the Treves episcopal dispute, wherein right was manifestly on the side of the secular authority. Dean Arnoldi was a pious and charitable priest, greatly admired as a preacher, a good Catholic, but no fanatic. Complacent, nay, pliable, he was readily influenced by the suggestions of that subterranean clerical staff known in Catholic Germany by the nickname of "the kitchen clergy." The late king knew his character, doubtless from Bodelschwingh's reports, and at the episcopal election of 1839 had stigmatised him as an undesirable. Nevertheless Arnoldi was elected, in plain contravention of the brief of 1821, and the crown, acting upon its legal rights, refused to confirm the appointment.[1] The pope was at that time still inspired with a fierce hatred of Prussia, and, without stating his reasons, contented himself with maintaining that the election was canonical. When the new reign opened, with good will on both sides the dispute might have been promptly settled, for Arnoldi, who was not an ambitious man, had already on June 1, 1840, transmitted a private declaration to Rome saying that he would like, with the pope's permission, to renounce his claim. This declaration was kept strictly secret in Rome, so that Brühl did not hear a word about the matter. Not until much later did he come to realise that the Vatican "wished to bargain," and that the Treves question was being purposely left open in order that Rome might have a better chance of getting her own way in Cologne.[2] The pope stubbornly refused to order a fresh election. He actually had the effrontery to contend that there were no binding prescriptions in the brief that had been agreed upon between the crown and the curia.[3]

Thereupon the king gave way. All that he now asked was that a new election should take place in due form of law. He proposed to give the chapter absolute freedom of election, not even vetoing Arnoldi, for he had in the interim received favourable reports of the dean, and believed that in this matter he would show himself wiser than his father. It seemed to him that he would pay due respect to the latter's memory by insisting upon a valueless and almost ludicrous

[1] Memorial to the king from Bülow and Eichhorn, March 12, 1842.
[2] Brühl's Report, March 15, 1841.
[3] See vol. III, p. 541.

formality. Eichhorn, who was likewise ignorant of Arnoldi's first act of renunciation, now wrote a friendly exhortation to the dean, whereupon, in January, 1841, the latter, as a good patriot, despatched to Rome a second declaration of his desire to relinquish the office—always subject to papal sanction.[1] The pope, however, refused to yield an inch even now, and Brühl could do nothing. Not until February, 1842, did Gregory sanction the resignation, though without declaring the previous election null. Thus were the forms grudgingly complied with, and when this had been done the king promptly permitted the chapter to furnish a list of candidates for the new election. Here was a fresh and needless concession, one which went far beyond the prescriptions of the state law. How much pains Niebuhr had taken in earlier days to save Prussia from the introduction of the dangerous *scrutin de liste,* and to secure for the crown an unconditional right of veto. This was why Lambruschini, in his first conversation with Brühl, had railed against the great historian. Now Frederick William had sacrificed his honoured teacher's well-planned work, though of course for this occasion only. The inevitable happened. Arnoldi's name headed the list of candidates; the king approved the list without comment; and in June Arnoldi was elected. Even yet, however, there had not been enough of weakness. Since the newly elected bishop found a passage in the bishops' customary oath of allegiance objectionable, Frederick William had the offending phrase struck out. On his way home from the festival of Cologne cathedral, the king visited the bishop of Treves in his metropolitanate, and was stirred to the very soul on the occasion. But the near future was to show how sound had been the late monarch's judgment of this prelate.

Almost more lamentable was the conclusion of the Breslau trouble. In this case, however, the fault lay not so much with the king as with the peaceable disposition of the prince bishop. This noble and pious prelate was harshly but not unjustly described as follows by his friend Brühl: "Sedlnitzky is a dull, irresponsible fellow, neither statesman nor bishop. What a pity he ever became anything more than an ecclesiastical councillor or an educational councillor!" Shortly before the late king's death, the pope had written to ask the bishop to resign office,[2] but since the request had not been made

[1] Arnoldi to Eichhorn, January 19; Brühl's Report, February 26, 1841.
[2] See vol. VI, p. 268.

in due canonical form, and since no prior intimation had been sent to the crown of Prussia, it had been devoid of legal significance. Nevertheless, Count Sedlnitzky felt the ground quaking under his feet. After the state authority had given way upon the matter of mixed marriages, it was impossible for him to remain more royalist than the king, impossible for him to maintain the old procedure in conjugal affairs. He was by no means popular. A retiring and studious little man, though never weary in well doing, he was hardly known by sight to the bigoted Poles of Upper Silesia. Under his benevolent leadership, the Breslau chapter had split into factions. The chief of the ultramontane zealots was Canon Förster, worldly-wise and ambitious, admired as a preacher even by the Protestants, and at one time accounted liberal, but now much influenced by Father Beckx, the Jesuit. The clericalist hotspurs detested the bishop. Ketteler termed him a miserable wretch because he was loyal to Prussia and friendly to the Protestants. Since the closing years of the last reign, negotiations had been pending for the return of certain Silesian churches which had been filched from the Protestants during the days of the Austrian dominion. In this matter Sedlnitzky set to work with a freedom from prejudice most creditable to his sense of justice, but on Roman Catholic principles unpardonable in a man in his position. The cardinals were so ignorant of German affairs that they actually regarded him as a Hermesian. In reality he had ever opposed these tenets. He hoped, indeed, for the return of all the sects to the bosom of a purified Catholic church. This ideal of universalised Christianity was interpreted by him in the sense of an inward rebirth, a *μετάνοια*, and it was therefore inevitable that he would sooner or later go far beyond the Hermesians, and would ultimately attain to a knowledge of Protestant truth.

He was consequently isolated. His nature being what it was, all his energy of will was perforce concentrated upon religious sensibilities and religious research, rather than upon the struggles of everyday life. It was difficult to remember that he was brother to the Viennese chief of police, a man notorious the world over for harshness and brutality. After earnest self-examination, he replied to the pope that he was willing to lay down the office which he had reluctantly assumed. He then visited Berlin, and there implored the king to approve this step. There was, he said, no other course open. In

view of the ultramontane sentiments and the vaingloriousness of most of the clergy in his diocese, he could no longer hope, he declared, to do good work there, and he was most unwilling, by remaining, to hinder the attainment of peace between state and church.[1] Frederick William was greatly annoyed by the arbitrary conduct of the curia. But how could one weakling support another? After a few days' ineffectual protest, he approved the resignation of the prelate whose only fault was an unduly faithful observance of the old state laws. On July 29th, in the most cordial terms, he made Count Sedlnitzky a privy councillor. In private conversation he added the assurance that he approved the resignation solely on account of his pious regard for his father's memory. Frederick William had a marvellous way of seeing everything in a different light from other men.

The retiring bishop poured out his soul in a touching valedictory address to the chapter, saying that he hoped for an unfailing unity with those who truly believed in Christ. This was a thoroughly Christian sentiment, though it was unquestionably anything but Roman Catholic. The ancient church had no longer any sphere of usefulness for men of such views. This had already become apparent to Wessenberg, who now from Constance, his sometime see, sent greetings to the colleague whose fate resembled his own. Sedlnitzky's relinquishment of office was effected even more quietly than had been Wessenberg's. Henceforward he lived in Berlin, entirely devoted to good works and to religious meditation. Shaken to the soul by the sermons of Nitzsch, Stahn, and Müllensiefen, he came to realise where the essence of Christianity must be sought, and before long found it impossible to continue the wearing of his episcopal habit. When finally, now advanced in years, his reflections led him to their necessary conclusion, and when (the first Catholic bishop to take such a step since the days of the reformation) in 1862 he received the lord's supper in a Protestant church, the conversion attracted little attention outside the theological world. He remained to the last what he had always been, a pious Christian, a true patriot, and a lovable human being, but was in no sense a pioneer. Cordially sympathetic, and quite free from bitterness, continued henceforward his outlook on the old church, the church which had made him a canon before he was twelve years of age

[1] Sedlnitzky to King Frederick William, July 14, 1840.

and had subsequently handled him so roughly. By the Protestants he was beloved as an example of earnest and deeply felt piety, and he will long be gratefully remembered for a number of benevolent foundations.

Having thus incontinently permitted the overthrow of Sedlnitzky, the king promptly went on to stop the proceedings relating to the restoration of the stolen Protestant churches. What, in such circumstances, could it avail that Brühl was commissioned to demand unambiguous satisfaction for the arbitrary dismissal of the bishop? A few somewhat acrimonious conversations with Lambruschini were the only result. Without the direct approval,[1] but with the tacit toleration, of the crown, Canon Ritter, professor of ecclesiastical history, was now appointed locum tenens in the vacant bishopric. This professor was a fierce ultramontane, who declared that Christians must make their choice between Rome and Friedrich David Strauss, and who in his work *Irenikon* had recently maintained the supremacy of church over state. The next step was to hurry on the election. The pope took the necessary measures, without troubling to communicate with the crown, and the king, whose complaisance was inexhaustible, allowed the chapter "for this once" to draw up a list of candidates, though there was no warrant for the practice either in law or in custom.[2] The canons showed their gratitude by a sordid intrigue such as is possible only to clerics, and ultimately nominated no less than twelve candidates, most of whom belonged to the chapter, the members of this worthy confraternity having agreed to vote for one another.[3] Count Brühl, who was well-informed regarding the situation in Breslau, now began to have his suspicions. He was not actually afraid of a new coup de main on the pope's part, for, as he phrased it, "it is more in accordance with the spirit of contemporary policy to slip insidiously into an unguarded opening, rather than boldly to breach the wall and enter the fortress by storm." But in the event of the chapter's failing to come to a seasonable agreement, the pope, in accordance with the right of devolution, could himself nominate the bishop, with consequences which could be foreseen. Brühl, therefore, urgently advised that the

[1] Cabinet Order to Eichhorn, December 19, 1840.

[2] Gregory XVI, Brief to the Breslau chapter, November 21, 1840; Cabinet Order to Eichhorn, February 24, 1841.

[3] Eichhorn's Report to the king, April 15, 1841.

crown should take up the matter in earnest. Oral negotiations with individual canons were fruitless, for they would merely be repudiated.[1] Very ungraciously, therefore, the king commanded a canonical election by a majority vote; the chapter humbly begged to be excused; and, after much further intrigue, in August, 1841, the election at length took place, the choice falling upon Knauer, a prelate accepted by the crown as a persona grata, but a very old man, and little likely to hold effective sway over this distracted bishopric.[2]

In all possible respects the king sedulously endeavoured to spare the pope's feelings. When the bishopric of Jerusalem was founded, he conveyed definite assurances to Rome that the step nowise involved a thought of hostility to the Catholic church, assurances unquestionably ill-befitting a Protestant monarch.[3] It could not fail, therefore, to wound him deeply that on all possible occasions, and even in matters that had no political bearing, the curia should exhibit mistrust and ill-will. Before his ascent to the throne, Frederick William had arranged through Bunsen for the purchase of the Caffarelli palace on the Capitol as the habitation of the Prussian embassy. But Gregory could not forget Bunsen's arrogant declaration that the might of the papacy was destined to be shattered on these rocks of the Capitol.[4] His blood boiled whenever his eyes rested on the adjoining hill, where, as the cardinals were wont to say, heresy was being preached "à la barbe du pape." Nor could the Italians be blamed for taking it amiss that this shrine of ancient national memories should pass into the possession of a foreign embassy. Shortly after Bunsen's recall, Lambruschini lodged serious complaints with Buch because the Protestant congregation numbered among its members persons who had no connection with the embassy, because Prussia had ventured without the pope's authorisation to found an archæological institute upon the Tarpeian rock, because Prussia had actually established a Protestant hospital, and so on, and so on.[5] Buch had considerable difficulty in smoothing matters over for the time. But after the death

[1] Brühl's Reports, February 25 and July 19, 1841.

[2] Cabinet Orders to Eichhorn, April 23 and June 30; Petition from the chapter to Eichhorn, June 16; Reports from Lord Lieutenant Merckel, June 29 and August 27, 1841.

[3] Werther, Instruction to Brühl, August 16, 1841.

[4] See vol. IV, p. 198; vol. V, p. 260.

[5] Lambruschini to Buch, June 10; Buch's Report, June 23, 1838.

of Frederick William III, the curia suddenly came forward with the contention that the purchase of the Caffarelli palace had been legally invalid. This aroused the anger of the king, to whom the ownership of the beautiful site was very dear, and he wrote as follows to Brühl: "I look upon the palace as my property. It has been paid for and handed over. It is mine by the laws of every country. It is mine, too, by the customs of every country, those of Turkey excepted, and, as it now appears, those of the papal dominions as well." He consequently insisted that there must be a firm stand upon the matter, since the present moment was especially unpropitious for further concessions, seeing that nine million Protestants were already wroth with him on account of the great sacrifices that had just been effected, Dunin's return and Sedlnitzky's resignation. "Nevertheless," he concluded by saying, "the evacuation of the Capitol could be effected readily enough, but not for the embassy to find another home; in that case the withdrawal would be final, an eventuality perhaps the most satisfactory for both parties." [1] Such threats in the mouth of the good-natured monarch could avail little, and unfortunately it was soon to be disclosed that another of Bunsen's strokes of genius had been effected. The scatter-brained diplomatist had been content to conclude a *censo*, a mere terminable contract. Moreover, part of the palace was entailed, and the owner, Duke Caffarelli, was shortly after this placed under guardianship as a spendthrift.[2] Thus the curia had ample grounds for disputing the validity of the title deeds. Tedious and extremely disagreeable negotiations were requisite before the crown of Prussia could at length enter into undisputed enjoyment of the dearly bought acquisition.

The two archbishops, again, proved grasping in money matters. Dunin demanded a special payment for the expenses of his stay in Berlin during the period for which he had been compelled to reside in that city by the late king's order. His residence in the Prussian capital had been terminated by an unauthorised flight, and the prelate was magnanimous enough to make no charge for the costs of this remove. The residential expenses in Berlin were allowed.[3] Encouraged by his colleague's success, Droste now demanded the payment of a sum of twelve

[1] King Frederick William to Brühl, September 17, 1840.
[2] Brühl's Report, with accompanying Memorials September 6, 1841.
[3] Dunin to Eichhorn, May 27; Eichhorn's Report, July 6, 1841;

thousand thalers which during the four years of his absence had been deducted from his stipend in order to pay the vicar general. This was more than Bodelschwingh could tolerate, and he implored the king not to push consideration for the stiff-necked archbishop too far. Mühler and Eichhorn, too, declared that Droste had no legal justification for the claim, and that the payment, if made at all, would be an act of grace.[1] The upshot was that the limit even of Frederick William's generosity to the Romish church had at length been reached. The total cost of the proceedings against the two archbishops had been 21,754 thalers, 25 silbergroschen, 3 pfennige. When approving this statement of account the king took the opportunity of commanding that, henceforth, officials of tried honour, not irresponsible individuals, were to be employed in private police matters.[2] Frederick William here laid his finger upon the sorest spot in this unhappy episcopal dispute, which had profoundly demoralised the populace of the Catholic provinces, and had created a whole army of informers. Capaccini himself told Brühl with disgust that the Vatican was daily in receipt of despicable secret advices concerning the Prussian court and concerning private individuals.[3] But the government had often availed itself of unworthy means to guard against these clericalist intrigues.

Johannes Geissel, the new coadjutor in Cologne, fulfilled the anxious forebodings of the chapter, for he shared Droste's views, but was a younger and abler man, and was therefore a much greater menace to the enfeebled state authority. Whilst still quite young he had been a zealous collaborator upon the Mainz *Katholik*, the first periodical founded by the growing ultramontane party;[4] he had displayed some talent as an amateur poet and historian; and in the diocese of Spires he had shown himself to be a successful administrator. A Palatiner by birth, he was well acquainted with his native province, predominantly Protestant; was familiar with its detestation of priestcraft; and was on his guard against arousing hostility. He had a fine figure for a prelate, being of portly presence, with sparkling eyes that suggested a conjuncture of imperiousness and astuteness; and so well could he support

[1] Report from Eichhorn, May 27; from Mühler and Eichhorn, June 15, 1842.

[2] Cabinet Order to Wittgenstein, Bodelschwingh, and Arnim, August 1, 1842.

[3] Brühl's Report, September 3, 1840.

[4] See vol. III, p. 547.

his official dignity that he never looked foolish—not even during the ridiculous changes of vestment at high mass. In society he displayed the frank carriage of the man of the world who is well satisfied with life, and he was a master in the art of turning small talk to diplomatic uses. He never became a true Prussian, for despite the king's graciousness he sensed the Protestant spirit of the country, and his fatherland was the divine realm of the church which could alone bring salvation. After a conversation with Brühl (who was charmed by the prelate's gentle disposition and by his sound German sentiments),[1] and after a painful visit to the testy old archbishop, Geissel came to Berlin at the new year of 1842, where he was received with many marks of distinction, and where he promptly begged leave to tender his oath of allegiance to the monarch in person. The late king had invariably entrusted the discharge of these formalities to his commissaries, regarding it as unfair that the Catholic bishops, who already enjoyed such a superfluity of dignities when compared with the Protestant pastors of the Prussian church, should be given an additional privilege, and one granted to no other subject of the crown. But Frederick William IV unhesitatingly acceded to the request.

In his interviews with the king and with the minister for public worship and education, Geissel was able to bring forward, and fruitfully, a whole series of requests relating to ecclesiastical affairs. Among other things he desired unrestricted authority over the seminary, and asked for the discharge of the last of the Hermesians from the Rhenish university. He even demanded the dismissal of Rehfues, curator of Bonn university, for during the episcopal dispute Rehfues had, as in duty bound, resisted the attempted encroachments of Droste, and subsequently, in a well-conceived and pithy memorial, had defended the late king's ecclesiastical policy.[2] Since Geissel did not as yet venture to refer to this memorial, he alluded to the historical novels wherein Rehfues had given a truthful picture of the abominations of Spanish and Italian monastic life. This sufficed, and the brilliant historical novelist had to pass his days henceforward in enforced idleness at Rosenburg near Bonn. So thoroughly, already, was the state authority intimidated, that a Protestant curator of a royal university was

[1] Brühl's Report to the king, Coblenz, November 8, 1841.
[2] See vol. VI, p. 278.

dismissed from office because his writings were displeasing to a Catholic bishop. At court, everyone had a good word for the gentle new archbishop *in partibus*, and the Munich nuncio did not fail to commend him warmly to Brühl as "an apostle of peace." [1] Yet Geissel's first pastoral letter, though conciliatory in form, was conceived wholly in the spirit of those issued by his predecessor. At the same time, the proclamation that had been issued at the time of Droste's arrest was officially rescinded, and on March 9th the peevish old archbishop, who to the very last had dreaded "Prussian wiles," issued a belated pastoral letter on his own account. "Following the example of Moses, the friend of God," he raised his hands in supplication towards heaven, and handed over the care of his flock to the new bishop.

In the interim the crown had fulfilled its other promises to the Roman see. At the new year of 1841 it conceded to the bishops the right of free intercourse with the pope, whilst the right of the placet was modified, so that henceforward the obligation of notifying the civil authorities was to attach to those ecclesiastical proclamations only wherein the state had a direct interest. This implied no more than the renunciation of an obsolete privilege, of one which had become unworkable, for in the affair of Sedlnitzky's resignation it had been more than once made manifest that in this age of free communication the placet could readily be evaded. As far as the bishops were concerned, their new freedom was merely a nuisance to them, for hitherto Vatican affairs, always overburdened with detail, had been attended to by the royal embassy, whereas now the prelates were compelled to maintain agents in Rome, and these were not invariably all that could be desired.[2] Nevertheless, it was a bold, magnanimous, and liberal-minded action for the king of his own free initiative to renounce a sovereign right to which most other rulers (including those of the Catholic persuasion) still clung, and a right regarded as indispensable by the orthodox liberals of the day. This "splendid proof of royal confidence" was greeted by the bishops with asseverations of everlasting gratitude and inviolable loyalty.[3]

[1] The nuncio Viale Prela to Brühl, February 11, 1842.

[2] Brühl's Report, Rome, August 3, 1841.

[3] Letters of acknowledgment to Eichhorn from the bishops and episcopal administrators, respectively, dated Münster January 13, Culm January 13, Treves January 16, Paderborn January 18, Cologne January 20, 1841, etc.

Far more momentous were the results of the founding of a Catholic department in the ministry for public worship and education, an event that took place on February 14, 1841. The first proposal to this effect had emanated from Würtemberg, and had been approved by the late king.[1] His successor had expanded the original design. Frederick William IV wished, as he explained in advance to his minister for public worship and education, to accord independence to both churches, constituting on the one hand a supreme consistory, and on the other assembling the Catholic bishops at regular intervals for conferences in Berlin. Further, the minor current affairs of ecclesiastical policy were to be entrusted to the new Catholic department of the ministry. Owing, however, to the party struggles within the Protestant church, the supreme consistory failed to come into existence during the next few years, and in these circumstances to summon a conference of the Catholic bishops would have greatly wounded the feelings of the Protestants. It followed almost as a matter of course that the powers it had been proposed to assign to the bishops' conference actually accrued to the Catholic department of the ministry. The bishops treated the department as an ecclesiastical authority, entering into confidential relationships with the Catholic privy councillors; sending them opinions, advice, and instructions; and endeavouring to carry out the plans of the church through the direct instrumentality of the ministry. These underground activities were begun forthwith, and boldly. Even during the first negotiations in Rome, Frederick William had through Count Brühl given the hardly credible assurance that in the event of a friendly attitude on the part of the curia he would appoint in the Catholic department such officials only as would enjoy the pope's confidence.[2] Thus the authority whose function it was to maintain the supremacy of the Prussian crown vis-à-vis the Catholic church, was to consist of persons thoroughly satisfactory to the curia! Never before had a state so guilelessly sacrificed its sovereignty to the Roman see.

The presidency in the new department was allotted to Under Secretary of State von Duesberg, an old friend and companion-at-arms of the pious Diepenbrock, and therefore no clericalist, though a good Catholic. His tenure of office was,

[1] See vol. VI, pp. 271 and 272.
[2] Brühl's Report, Rome, September 1, 1840.

however, brief. Schmedding, now well on in years, who despite his high church views still preserved many of the excellent traditions of the Old Prussian officialdom, had little influence. The soul of the new authority was Aulicke, the Westphalian, a declared ultramontane, the man who had conducted the negotiations for Dunin's return.[1] He was proud that it fell to his lot to be the representative of the Roman church, and would often answer the complaints of priests by saying in so many words: "The lord bishop does not permit that." The Catholic school system was under the care of Privy Councillor Theodor Brüggemann from Westphalia, Cornelius' brother-in-law, a distinguished scholar and trusty patriot, eloquent, cultured, and a good man of business. At one time he had inclined towards Hermesian views, and had then been regarded with much hostility by the Rhenish ultramontanes. But as he grew older he followed the example of his great brother-in-law in adopting a strictly Catholic outlook, so that it no longer sufficed him that the Catholic schools, which in Prussia were for the most part creations of the state, should be almost universally under the control of clerical inspectors. He demanded on behalf of the church a formal right of supervising the schools, though this claim was in direct conflict with the civil law. Further, with the powerful aid of the crown, the Catholic nobility of Posen now ventured to place one foot in the stirrup, and no long time elapsed before it was firmly seated in the ministerial saddle, so that most of the measures of the Catholic department were prepared in the Radziwill palace.

In this way there was brought about a false and morbid position of affairs, one which could not fail sooner or later to give rise to fresh struggles. The church which could alone bring salvation, an essentially intolerant power, possessed its own independent representation in the bosom of a government founded upon parity of religions, a government whose continued existence was impossible in default of religious peace. It is true that the king absolutely refused to receive a nuncio in his capital, although the Vatican had repeatedly expressed a strong desire for this concession.[2] Was it possible for a Protestant monarch to assign to a Roman Catholic priest the precedence among diplomatic envoys, a precedence which the pope invariably

[1] See vol. VI, p. 337.
[2] Brühl's Reports, September 3, 1840, and subsequent dates.

demanded for his nuncios? Could he tolerate that the malcontents from all the Catholic provinces should gather round the emissary of Rome? Such questions forced themselves upon the attention even of the unsuspicious Frederick William. The decisive point was that he still hoped to establish his episcopal conferences, and should these regularly assemble, a nuncio would be superfluous. On this occasion, therefore, the king took a firm stand, and when the Protestant journals, which had displayed much concern about the matter, continued to write of the coming of a nuncio, Frederick William, greatly incensed, gave orders that "these abominable rumours must be categorically denied." [1]

In such an atmosphere, the corn of the ultramontane party was quick to sprout. The last of the Hermesians made one more application to Rome, but since Pius IX confirmed his predecessor's condemnatory decree, they were compelled to discontinue their teaching activities. All that the state could do was to confirm them in the possession of their offices and incomes, seeing that the state had no concern in disputes regarding matters of religious dogma, and the consequence was that the only two who failed to comply, Professors Braun and Achterfeldt, had their names printed year after year in the lecture syllabus at Bonn, but with the melancholy addition: "Lectiones nullas habere pergent." Geissel, however, was not content with the right of veto which the law granted to the bishops in connection with the appointment of theological professors. At his very first visit to Berlin he raised the contention that the bishop was entitled to assign the professors a "missio canonica." In plain terms, he wished to appoint the professors himself, while graciously permitting the state to pay their salaries. As Schmedding said, the missio canonica was "quite a new invention." Not only did it conflict with the state laws, but it likewise contravened the canon law, for never before had the church attempted to treat as diocesan institutions the universities that had been created to serve the whole of Catholic Germany. None the less, and despite Eichhorn's objection, the king found the claim altogether unimpeachable. Shortly afterwards, the grateful Dunin claimed the right of nominating all the teachers of religion in his diocese, and even this encroachment was in all essentials tolerated by the crown. A cabinet order of November 6,

[1] The king's decision regarding Thile's Report of March 8, 1847.

1846, decreed that the ministers should first come to an agreement with the bishop regarding every new appointment to the office of religious teacher, that the bishop should then assign the canonical mission, and that only thereafter should the state ratify the nomination.

No long time elapsed before all uncertainty was dispelled regarding the sentiments of the new archbishop of Cologne. It is true that Geissel, an adroit courtier, hastened to placate the Rhenish nobles, who were ill satisfied with the partial victory that had been secured in the episcopal dispute. But he refused to appoint Diepenbrock provost of Cologne cathedral, notwithstanding a pressing request to that effect from the king,[1] for the Ratisbon canon seemed to him of too peaceable a disposition, and was moreover too distinguished to be a suitable subordinate. Canon Iven, the man to whom for a time the pope had arbitrarily entrusted the administration of the archbishopric, was Geissel's first confidential adviser; whilst subsequently Baudri, the suffragan, served him in that capacity. Both these clerics were declared ultramontanes. Of like views was Weis, the founder of the Mainz *Katholik*, who upon Geissel's recommendation was now appointed bishop of Spires. The king, who naïvely hoped that the Roman church would soon outgrow its interest in temporal concerns, had utterly failed to read the signs of the times. Never since the days of Tetzel had the clergy of western Germany given itself up to so ostentatious a succession of festivities and ceremonies. The cathedral festival of Cologne was followed by that of the exhibition of the holy coat of Treves. Next, in Aix-la-Chapelle, the swaddling clothes of the Christ child were displayed to the faithful—dingy rags whose authenticity was admitted even by Baudri to be doubtful, though he said there could be no question as to their sanctity. In Münster, finally, the jubilee of the old and blind bishop, Caspar Max Droste, was celebrated with unexampled pomp. Geissel participated actively in all these solemnities.

Thanks to the admirable educational institutions that had been founded by the Prussian state, the Rhenish clerics of the younger generation were better cultured than had been those of an earlier day, and since the Cologne festival they had frequently manifested a sympathetic interest in ancient ecclesiastical art. But the clergy no longer seemed to possess

[1] Thile to Eichhorn, June 24, 1842.

a will of its own vis-à-vis the archbishop. In accordance with the evil French custom, there were no regular canonical benefices on the left bank of the Rhine, so that here the priests, lacking a definite tenure of office, were completely under Geissel's thumb; whilst the new prelate's iron discipline sufficed to keep in leash even the incumbents of the right bank, whose positions were comparatively secure. He did not, like his friend Reisach, avowedly belong to the order of Jesus, but during Geissel's regime the Bonn refectory was controlled by Professor Martin in a purely Jesuitic spirit. The soul of the Bonn faculty was Dieringer, a Swabian who had come with Geissel from Spires, a theologian whose scientific attainments were inconsiderable, but one who proved invaluable as an ultramontane partisan. Since the Catholic department of the ministry for public worship and education was intentionally lax, a number of religious houses were unostentatiously founded without the legally indispensable approval of the sovereign. The Rhenish clergy had long exercised political sway, and since the days for this were over, Geissel wished to replace it by a no less efficacious social dominion. A fine-meshed network of multifarious Catholic associations was spread over the country. These bodies did much excellent work in caring for the sick and for the poor, but they invariably preserved a rigidly sectarian stamp. Before long they were supplemented by Catholic societies whose aims were purely convivial, and these were openly or tacitly under priestly guidance. To an increasing degree, intercourse between Protestants and Catholics became restricted to business matters. In Catholic families, hatred of Protestants was so sedulously inculcated by the father confessor, that Catholics would now seldom engage Protestant servants.

Ecclesiastical affairs in Silesia were in somewhat better case. Knauer, the new prince bishop, died in 1844 after a brief term of office, and was succeeded, greatly to the king's gratification, by Melchior Diepenbrock, the finest character among the leading German ecclesiastics of that period. In 1840, when Radowitz was on his military tour, Frederick William had instructed him to visit the pious Westphalian in Ratisbon, and since then the king had continued to keep an eye on Diepenbrock. The latter's inauguration as prince bishop of Breslau afforded indications of the profound transformation that had taken place in ecclesiastical life. The

Catholic nobles gave their new prelate a reception previously unexampled during the period of Prussian dominion. Diepenbrock, in truth, was not lacking in pride of port. A long, thin figure, with fine eyes and the piercing gaze of the enthusiast, he showed in every gesture how greatly exalted above every layman he now felt himself to be. No power in the world was to seduce him from the strictest fulfilment of his churchly duties. He had made his entry into Breslau driving beside Prince Hatzfeldt, but barely two years later he excommunicated the prince, who had in the interim been divorced from his wife and had contracted a new marriage. Nor was he entirely unaffected by the clericalist trend of the day, and before long, like Geissel, he demanded the right of assigning a canonical mission to the theological professors at the provincial university. Nevertheless, the living spirit of Christianity was for him a thing infinitely greater than the power of his church. When, after his consecration as bishop, he strode majestically to the front of the altar and with a clang planted his crosier upon the marble steps, with the exclamation: "Thus do I place my episcopal staff upon the eternal rock, which is Christ," to many of the Protestants present on the occasion the words had more of a Protestant than of a Roman Catholic sound. He was a man of strong religious convictions, but withal a good Prussian, one who, despite his kindly feeling for Bavaria, never did anything that ill became the sometime military officer in the Prussian service, and in a troublous time he unflinchingly manifested his loyalty to the state. Against the curse of spirit drinking among the peasants of Upper Silesia he worked to the utmost of his power, not merely by promoting the spread of abstinence societies, but in addition by the only efficacious means, the provision of a supply of wholesome beer, summoning brewers from Bavaria for this purpose. When there was a famine in the mountains, his brothers of charity gave ready help everywhere. The king's affection for him was not difficult to understand. When Frederick William visited Erdmannsdorf, he invariably invited the prince bishop to join the family circle, and although the king could never be disloyal to Protestantism, no one could fail to notice that he paid more honour to this Catholic prelate that to any Protestant divine.

The defeat of the crown in the episcopal dispute aroused less widespread indignation among the Protestants than Frederick

William had anticipated. The sense of the state was as yet little developed, and the catchword "freedom of the churches" still exercised its alluring charm. The liberals made no complaints, for their favourites the Rhinelanders were content, and the sun continued to rise in the west. As for the young radicals, to them all ecclesiastical questions seemed matters of no moment. Yet warning voices were raised. The trusty Arndt, who had for so many years made his home on the Rhine, and had discarded there the Swedish-Lutheran prejudices of his upbringing, declared bluntly nevertheless in his essay *A Few German Observations*: "The Jesuits are back again, and, as of old, they will undermine and destroy German love and German fidelity." Count Anton Stolberg, who returned in May, 1844, from a visit to the West Prussian domains, gave the king a straightforward assurance to the effect that the Catholic Poles throughout this region were filled with overweening pride, vociferating: "One must be a Catholic to-day to have any influence at court." [1] King William of Würtemberg, too, was greatly concerned, and he frequently debated with Rochow, the Prussian envoy, whether it would not be expedient for the Protestant princes of Germany to combine under Prussia's leadership for the joint protection of their rights of supremacy over the church.

In truth, the ultramontane party had secured almost all the advantages which a parity state could concede. One of the hotheads of this group, a convert named Gasser, a Franciscan, made the round of the South German courts, boastfully announcing wherever he went that the Roman church could secure anything it wanted at the court of Berlin. But clericalists share with radical democrats an insatiable appetite, for both parties alike are the devotees of rigid principles which conflict with the unceasing movement of history and are therefore impossible of fulfilment. Still unsatisfied, the ultramontanes speedily demanded further privileges, asking first of all for the fulfilment of a promise given years before, that the church should be furnished with real estate by the crown. In the Rhenish diet of 1843, this pledge given by Hardenberg, a pledge which had been lightheartedly recalled to memory by Bunsen during the closing days of his envoyship in Rome, was alluded to in fiery speeches. Fortunately, it could not now be carried out, for the crown had no power to alienate any

[1] Stolberg's Report to the king, May 16, 1844.

portion of the domains without permission of the national assembly. The next demand was that at the two parity universities half the professors, those in the medical faculty not excepted, should always be Catholics—an arbitrary claim, and one utterly impossible to countenance in view of the scarcity of duly qualified Catholics. Behind all this was the wish for a free Catholic university after the Belgian model, "free" signifying "entirely controlled by the church." To cloak their true aims, the ultramontanes complained in moving terms that Bavaria had two Catholic universities, whereas Prussia, a much larger country, had not a single one. The complaint was completely devoid of foundation, for the two parity universities were fully competent to supply the needs of Catholic theology. These complaints found willing hearers, none the less. With a little forethought, however, the crown could have silenced them, for the Münster academy, which in its present form suffered from the curse which invariably attaches to half-measures, might have been equipped as a Catholic state university, by superadding to its Catholic theological faculty three lay faculties open to persons of all creeds. The resource seemed obvious, but unfortunately the plan was not adopted, the king being evidently afraid that the Protestants of Westphalia, who comprised nearly half the population of the province, would in their turn feel aggrieved.

A writing published by Görres in 1842, *Church and State at the Close of the Cologne Dispute,* showed how vast now had become the self-conceit of the ultramontanes. The book suggested the war-whoop of an Indian who had just taken his enemy's scalp. The hotblooded veteran's fierceness had increased with advancing years, and he declared that there could no longer be any bond of national community between the two creeds. At the close of his countless political transformations, the editor of the *Rheinische Merkur* now sang the praises of the Rhenish Confederate trias. Bavaria, he said, was the natural leader of the lesser states, Bavaria was the natural intermediary between the two great powers—although Bavaria was at this time detested at almost all the German courts on account of her ultramontane misrule!

The ultimate aim of the clericalists was disclosed with wonted frankness by Clemens August Droste in a work penned during his exile, and entitled *Concerning Peace between the Church and the States.* This was but a further exposition of

what he had written in earlier years anent *The Religious Liberty of Catholics.*[1] The new book was no less amateurish than had been the previous one. It carried weight, however, not only on account of its author's name, but also because of its alarming plainspokenness, which compelled Marheineke and other Protestant theologians to reply to it without a moment's delay. Droste declared that the Roman church was the kingdom of God on earth. To the state he conceded a mere right of protecting the church, whilst conversely the church was competent to protect the state. From these considerations he deduced a truly revolutionary political doctrine. Just as of old the jacobins had counterposed the rights of man to all positive law, so did Droste distinguish the "state laws," springing from the nature of the state and binding upon the church as well, from the arbitrary "national or territorial laws" promulgated by the rulers, laws to which the church owed no allegiance. Never since the days of the Convention had the doctrine of the revolution been more impudently announced. Those who exalt a fancied natural right above the laws of the living state, destroy every bond of loyalty and obedience in political life, and it matters little that some who do this clasp their hands in prayer and abase themselves before the images of the saints, whilst others caper round the tree of liberty. The state, said Droste in conclusion, must as a minimum concede equal rights to the church, which has in truth the right to dominate the state. No regard must be paid to the foolish discontent of the Protestants, who have learned from their Luther nothing more than bondage to immorality, to pride of reason, and to doubt.

Such was the honest confession of faith with which the old champion of the one and only saving church took his farewell of the political stage. Never again did he visit his episcopal see, but despite his years he would not forego the pilgrimage to Rome, dwelling there in the house of a pious Westphalian printer, and devoting himself to pious meditation, recking little of the tokens of honour bestowed on him by the Vatican. It was remarkable that this man who never succeeded in writing a sentence of readable prose, should have experienced moments of undeniable poetic inspiration. It was upon one of these occasions that he wrote the hymn so often sung by the children of both faiths, "Let thy heart

[1] See vol. III, p. 555.

943

point heavenwards, point heavenwards like a sun-dial." Yet more plainly was the ruggedness of the Westphalian prelate displayed in the verses:

> Like to the hardest-timbered tree
> Must man confront the storm,
> And with an iron will must he
> His every deed perform.

His death took place in the year 1845. Archbishop Droste was one of those blind and unwilling instruments which providence at times selects for the fulfilment of its unsearchable designs. Beyond question he ranks as a character in history, for with his name is associated the memory of one of the most notable mutations in German party life.

§ 2. THE ABEL MINISTRY AND THE BLITTERSDORF MINISTRY.

Yet more plainly than Droste's book spoke the deeds of the ultramontane party in Bavaria. For a decade in that country the rule of the ultramontanes had been unchallenged, and they had been able to effect the utter destruction of religious peace, which had been the best feature of Bavarian life. Shortly after Sedlnitzky's resignation, a clericalist hotspur, a member of the Breslau chapter, wrote as follows: "Do not be led astray by the rumour that a reversal of policy in religious matters is imminent in Bavaria. The adversaries will be put down with an iron hand. Now that in Germany as elsewhere the decisive struggle between the temporal and the spiritual powers is at hand, the hostile supports must crumble, and history teaches us that victory in the end is with Rome." [1] As a matter of fact, King Louis was now entirely mastered by clericalist ideas. Nothing was further from his mind than a deliberate plan for the destruction of the parity system, which he continued to regard as one of the treasures of his kingdom. Nevertheless, since the disturbances in the Palatinate and the unruly proceedings of the last diet, it had seemed to him that the rights of his crown were imperilled. "But there is still time," he said; "I stand as firmly fixed as the rocky walls which tower above the

[1] Despatch to the Catholic provost of Berlin, June 12, 1841, from a member of the Breslau chapter, presumably Ritter.

LIBRARY OF
LAMAR STATE COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY

sea." For the safety of the crown he put his trust in the clericalists' new doctrine of salvation, and it seemed to him henceforward that the main content of contemporary history was comprised in the struggle between Rome and the revolution. By following the example of his ancestor, Elector Maximilian I, by giving his powerful protection to German Catholicism, he hoped, not merely to check the progress of revolution, but in addition to outsoar Prussia, the object of his mingled love and suspicion. Recovering from the disastrous adventure in Greece, the house of Wittelsbach was to acquire the position of a great power in Europe.

As long as the king's unstable spirit was swayed by ideas of such a character, Minister Abel was his aptest counsellor. Abel was an excellent man of business, indefatigable, as a bureaucrat pitiless in his severity, harsh and domineering, dreaded in the diet for his ready wit and his fiery eloquence. Hailing from Wetzlar, Abel had at one time been a member of the Greek regency, and had assisted Maurer, the Protestant Palatiner, in the latter's plans for reform. In the Munich diet, too, Abel had advocated a number of liberal measures. People were still fond of relating how fiercely in those days he had railed against the censorship, describing it as the crutch of a weak, the fetter of a powerful government. Subsequently, having experienced a severe shock in the loss of his wife, he had cut adrift from his old associates, to find peace in the austere, authoritarian doctrines of the clericalists, and it was henceforward his custom to attend early mass at the Theatine church. Writing to Hurter, a man of kindred views, he declared that the throne had never been beset with such dangers, and that help could be looked for from the church alone. He took it as a sign from God that almost at the very time when he joined the government, Droste-Vischering should have broken down the dam and let loose the ultramontane flood upon Germany. It was after Haller's method that he wished to conduct the campaign on behalf of throne and altar. Little did it concern him in his fanaticism that such a policy incensed the Bavarian Protestants, a third of the population, against the crown; little did it matter to him that he endangered the stability of all the Protestant dynasties of Germany. Indeed, the more involved the situation should become in Protestant Germany, the higher would rise the star of the devout Wittelsbachs. Doubtless Abel was no mere religious

zealot; he was a statesman as well; and in his inexorable fulfilment of his Catholic master's autocratic wishes, it was inevitable that from time to time the minister should give umbrage to his clericalist friends. Nevertheless the ultramontanes displayed black ingratitude when, after Abel's fall, they one and all abandoned the man who was now hated and reviled, and when they denied that he had ever been one of their own party. For it was the minister alone whom they had to thank if they had been able for a time upon the Isar to exercise a sway no less unrestricted than they had exercised so long upon the Rhine, the "priests' alley" of the Holy Roman Empire.

Upon this matter Rome was well advised. Directly Abel rose to power, the curia recognised that the time had arrived when the clergy could lay out for themselves a miniature garden of Eden no less charming than that which they possessed in Belgium. The Roman interests were ably represented by the nuncio Viale Prela, a talented and amiable prelate, well acquainted with Germany and fond of the country. A worldly-wise Latin, he was frequently alarmed by the fierce zealotry of his Bavarian adherents. Through the operations of a benevolent fate, during the next few years vacancies ensued in most of the Bavarian bishoprics, and in all cases, with Abel's cheerful cooperation, vigorous young clericalists were appointed to these sees, men of Jesuit leanings, or at least convinced ultramontanes. Weis became bishop of Spires; Stahl, of Würzburg; Hoffstätter, of Passau; Riedel, of Ratisbon. Reisach of Eichstädt was the leader of this fighting episcopate. At first coadjutor of the elderly archbishop of Munich, he succeeded ere long to this see, and just as in former days he had made a great sensation and had edified all persons of childlike disposition by making his entry into the town of St. Wilibald habited as a cowled pilgrim, so now did he know how to appeal to the theatrical instincts of upper class society in the capital. The professor of canon law in Munich was Phillips, the Prussian renegade, whose hatred for his forsaken fatherland was inextinguishable. He was already teaching that œcumenical councils had merely a deliberative voice, seeing that the church was founded upon the rock of Peter. Thus step by step did he draw nearer to the dogma of papal infallibility to which clerical dialectic could not fail to lead in the end. Moy, recently summoned from Würzburg

as teacher of public law, promulgated in a somewhat more acceptable form the doctrine of the civitas Dei which Droste-Vischering had advocated in his last writing. For Moy, the alleged supremacy of state over church, and indeed all supreme powers ascribed to the state, were the artificial constructions of pseudo-liberal theory.

Not in vain had the veteran Görres sounded the war cry: "Hammer or anvil is the watchword of the century!" The world over, the clericalists were making new and unprecedented claims. The *Historisch-politische Blätter für das Katholische Deutschland* demanded without periphrasis that the church and the clergy should have absolute control of science and education; all the blessings of the German secular school system, the work of three centuries, were to be thrown on the rubbish heap. In the French house of peers, Count Montalembert simultaneously opened his vigorous campaign against state education. To this chivalrous enthusiast it seemed indisputable that the Catholic church must be queen or nothing. Since the rigidity of the Napoleonic educational system, the dull uniformity of the lycées, the pedantry "of the mandarins of the universities," did in truth offer much ground for criticism, he honestly regarded himself as a champion of liberty when he wished to subject the schools once again to the yoke of the clergy, and when he warned the sons of the crusaders not to yield ground before the sons of Voltaire. By birth and training, Montalembert was half English and half French; he had recently married a Belgian, daughter of Félix de Mérode, the ultramontane leader; and this peculiarly cosmopolitan tendency of the Romanist party was manifest likewise in the Munich ultramontane circle. In court society were to be found, in addition to the old ultramontane stocks of Löwenstein, Arco, Cetto, Deuxponts, Rechberg, and Seinsheim, Prince Polignac, the ill-fated minister of Charles X, the Rohans, and the members of the Carlist house of Lichnowsky. Prince Felix Lichnowsky enjoyed Abel's particular favour. When the duke of Nassau was travelling in Bavaria, Lichnowsky had a personal quarrel with him, challenged him to a duel, and threatened to horsewhip him. Lichnowsky went unpunished, and it was months before the Protestant duke could secure the expulsion of his hotheaded opponent.[1]

Demagogic elements were, however, associated with the

[1] Dönhoff's Reports, April 30, May 14, and June 16, 1840.

aristocratic; for this league of the protagonists of Rome, ignoring national frontiers, ignored also the delimitations of the political parties. Görres, who never completely overcame his radical leanings, had open house for French legitimists and Swiss Jesuits, who rubbed shoulders there with Polish revolutionaries. Under the same roof assembled the motley crowd of ultramontane men of letters: Höfler, the historian, recently appointed editor of the semi-official *Münchener Zeitung*; the staff of the *Sion*, an Augsburg periodical; last not least the henchmen of the "yellow leaves" (*Historisch-politische Blätter*), a journal which ran atilt against all the world, but which rarely criticised the Bavarian administration, for it needed the support of the all-powerful minister. Comparatively innocuous was the cheerful circle of guests in the house of Emilie Linder, a wealthy and pious convert nicknamed "the Swiss spinster," idolised by Clemens Brentano, and a friend of Cornelius, Ringseis, and Diepenbrock. Here could still be enjoyed the aromatic flavour of the old romanticist culture. But the gentler currents could make no headway against the fanaticism which dominated the Munich "congregation." Möhler, the leading intelligence among the Catholic theologians of Germany, regarded these changes with profound distress. He had been summoned to Munich shortly before Abel's rise to power, and quite recently, defending his *Symbolism* against the onslaughts of Christian Baur, he had shown plainly enough that he had no dread of honourable scientific controversy with however formidable an opponent. But he was loath to see his church enter the political arena; and especially distasteful to him were the ultramontane pressmen, "the rabble of literary detractors" following in the wake of the congregation. Abel had no use for this man of delicate susceptibilities and infirm health. Möhler was suddenly transferred to the deanship at Würzburg, where his premature death in 1838 relieved him from an intolerable situation.

The chief connecting link in the party was an intense hatred of Prussia; this was the bond of union between its bureaucratic, its demagogic, and its aristocratic elements. Hence it was that the Austrian envoy, Count Senfft-Pilsach, became one of the most active members of the ultramontane faction. This was the man who as Saxon minister during the War of Liberation had vainly attempted to lead his master into the paths of Viennese policy. Since then, having completely

fallen away from the faith of his Protestant family, he had continued to enjoy the particular favour of Metternich. He maintained relationships with the clericalists of many lands, and was in the habit of meeting his friend Abel of an early morning at mass in the Theatine church. Metternich, too, like the two Bavarian sisters in Vienna, now resumed a lively correspondence with the court of Munich. Jealousy of the customs union and of the increasing power of Prussia left him no rest, and it seemed to him that the Roman church offered the only means whereby the northern rival might still be brought under control. During the autumn of 1841 he spent several days in Munich, seeing much of the king and of the nuncio. The faithful Jarcke introduced him to the leaders of the "congregation." After these interviews he despatched ecclesiastico-political instructions to Biebrich and Stuttgart.[1] Astonishing was the way in which this veteran statesman had now unquestioningly adopted the religious outlook which had been so uncongenial to him in his pleasure-loving youth. No longer did he hesitate to express the strictly Romanist view that a state whose population was predominantly Catholic was within the fold of the church, since this was the church universal. Among the clericalist writers, Hurter, the bitterest of them all, was the favourite. For years Hurter had worked on behalf of Rome, and had even gone so far as to transmit to the archbishop of Freiburg a privy brief from the pope. At length, however, when a straightforward enquiry had been addressed to him by his colleagues at Schaffhausen, he was compelled to resign the Protestant office he had so shamelessly misused. Some years later still he was formally received as a Roman Catholic. Abel had ever found him a willing assistant. Metternich, when he read Hurter's *History of Pope Innocent III, and his Contemporaries*, delightedly exclaimed, "The author is my man," and in 1845 appointed him imperial and royal historiographer at Vienna, Hurter's first task being to compile a *History of Ferdinand II*. It would have been impossible to give clearer evidence that the Hofburg had completely broken with Josephan principles.

Vis-à-vis such a party, Count Dönhoff's position was one of much difficulty. It was inevitable that the Bavarian Protestants, who had so frequently acclaimed the late sovereign of Prussia as protector of the Protestant faith, should frequently

[1] Dönhoff's Report, October 9, 1841.

apply to the Protestant envoy for help in their troubles;[1] and although Dönhoff, in accordance with his official duty, exhibited as much reserve as honour permitted, it was not long before he was vilified by the ultramontanes as leader of the Protestant opposition. The lamb was stirring up the mud in the innocent wolf's stream. At the very time when Abel was inciting the new archbishop of Cologne to resist the ecclesiastical policy of the Protestant courts, the minister accused the Berlin pietists (who had quite enough to do to attend to their party struggles at home) of claiming for the crown of Prussia a protectorate over the Bavarian Protestants. Among "the Berlin pietists" he thought especially of Eichhorn, to whom all the adherents of Austria attributed the most sinister designs. King Louis, unfortunately, was by no means inaccessible to such suggestions. Desirous of assuming the role of the Catholic Elector Maximilian, he scented everywhere Protestant political intrigues. Even the English vagaries of his Prussian brother-in-law seemed to him a menace to the Roman church.[2] Wishing to establish a counterpoise to the bishopric of Jerusalem, he despatched a few Bavarian scholars to the Promised Land, and these endeavoured, with scant success, to found Catholic monasteries and hospitals. When Dönhoff became Prussian federal envoy, and when his successor Count Bernstorff came to pay his respects to the Bavarian monarch, Louis complained bitterly of the partisan attitude of the previous envoy. Bernstorff, replying both verbally and in writing, declared that he would never interfere in Bavarian party life. He could not, however, repel his coreligionists; he could not repudiate the political and religious sympathies of his government; he could not abstain from replying to passionate attacks upon Protestant governments. King Frederick William's comment was: "He has spoken and written as a man of honour and as a true Prussian envoy. Convey to him my full satisfaction with his conduct." King Louis was forced to recognise the frankness of the Prussian's behaviour.[3] None the less, and despite the personal friendship between the royal brothers-in-law, the relationships between the courts were troubled. It was the curse of ultramontane party dominion

[1] See vol. VI, p. 88.

[2] Dönhoff's Reports, January 20 and February 2, 1842.

[3] Bernstorff's Reports, October 31 and November 2; Gise to Bernstorff, November 2; Ministerial Despatch to Bernstorff, November 12 and 13, 1845.

that it did not merely hinder Bavaria's internal development, but that, further, it alienated that country's natural ally.

King Louis first became mistrustful of his clericalist adherents when in the year 1841 Eberhard, the court chaplain, delivered in the church of St. Michael a series of sermons so loaded with coarse invectives as to seem deliberately designed to spur on the densely packed audience to war against the Protestants. Luther was spoken of as a pitiful cheat; Protestant marriage was whoredom; a mixed marriage was a sacrilege; the Catholic mother who allowed her child to be brought up as a Protestant sinned against the laws of nature. So much anger was aroused that several Protestants of repute (Thiersch was among the number) addressed complaints to the throne. Diepenbrock, at that time still a member of the Ratisbon chapter, considered it hardly credible that anyone should thus degrade the pulpit into a cockpit. Diepenbrock's friend Bishop Schwäbl, an old man already sickening with his last illness, penned a well-worded letter to the Munich zealot, reminding him of the duties of Christian love. "The spirit of your sermons," wrote the bishop, "is not from above, for it is the spirit of human perversity." Eberhard wrote an impudent reply, which was received by the bishop on his deathbed. The king now took action, temporarily forbidding the court chaplain to preach at St. Michael's. "Eberhard," wrote Louis, "if he has not actually hastened Schwäbl's death, has at least embittered the worthy bishop's last days." [1] Subsequently Abel had to send a despatch to all the circle governments, instructing them to supervise the sermons that were preached, and to interfere when these tended to disturb religious peace or to convey materialistic doctrines. The archiepiscopal diocesan court in Munich, which secretly supported Eberhard, thereupon entered a protest, bluntly declaring that the contention in the despatch that the fundamental doctrines of Christianity were common to all creeds, led to indifferentism. The redoubtable minister made no rejoinder. Before long, Eberhard was permitted to resume his sermons. He and Wiser, another preacher attached to the court, rivalled one another in their fulminations against the stiff-necked Protestants, who, in Bavaria at any rate, had ample opportunities for learning Catholic truth. The monarch was more lastingly displeased by the conduct of the clergy on the occasion of the funeral of

[1] King Louis to the ministry for religious affairs, July 19, 1841.

Caroline, the queen dowager (November, 1841). Her numerous daughters had been brought up as Catholics; she had been benefactress to excellent institutions belonging to both creeds; but she had ever clung to her Protestant faith, prizing to the utmost the old and tried alliance between Prussia and Bavaria. During the last year of the life of Frederick William III she had visited Potsdam in order to reestablish friendly relations between the two courts.[1] These were reasons enough for the hatred felt by the clericalists. The Protestant clergy proposed that the queen's body, after the obsequies, should be conveyed to the royal vault beneath the Theatine church, there to receive the last rites. This would have been in conformity with the general practice, for since the days of Montgelas the excellent principle established by the peace of Westphalia, that the German Protestants were not to be treated as heretics, had secured general acceptance even in Bavaria. All the Protestants of Munich were accustomed to bury their dead with the proper religious observances in the beautiful town cemetery, which had been consecrated in accordance with Catholic ritual. But Windischmann, the hotspur of the chapter, conferred in profound secrecy with Abel.[2] Thereupon the archbishop issued a prohibition, and even forbade the sisters of charity, who wished to follow their munificent benefactress to her grave, to participate in any way whatever. Consequently the queen's body was kept waiting outside the door of the Theatine church in pouring rain while the funeral ceremony took place, and was then hustled into the vault, whilst the Catholic priests, in their black cassocks, looked on supinely. Hardly less unseemly was the official requiem in the episcopal cities. In Augsburg alone did Bishop Richarz, a prelate of the old school, institute a worthy festival, though without a mass for the dead. He informed his sovereign that as a loyal subject he felt he could do no less, but he had been unable to do more in view of the archbishop's instructions. "It is my conviction," he added, "that those who are rationally devoted to the conservative principles in religion and in life, should preach and practise, not hatred, but love."[3]

The king hastened to thank his loyal servant in a letter of commendation which was published forthwith. He was

[1] Dönhoff's Report, December 8, 1839.
[2] Dönhoff's Report, November 27, 1841.
[3] Bishop Richarz to King Louis, November 24, 1841.

certainly unaware that his own minister had been partly responsible for the scandalous scene in Munich, nor was it until much later that he learned the holy father's opinion upon the matter. The erstwhile Camaldolite monk had been delighted at the contempt shown for the Protestant queen. Such was Gregory's mood when he despatched a severe, though not wholly ungracious, brief to the philheretic of Augsburg. The pope censured the bishop for having commended the deceased to the prayers of the faithful, and concluded with the paternal exhortation that the bishop had better atone for his error, and protect his faithful flock "against the vain delusion of those flatterers who falsely declare that one who has lived in estrangement from the Catholic faith and the Catholic church, and who has died without renouncing error, can attain to eternal life." To prepare for the future, the pope shortly afterwards sent a second brief to the provost of the Benedictine monastery at Scheyern, which the king had recently refounded. "The holy see," wrote Gregory, "cannot confirm this foundation unless the official requiems for members of the royal house are to be celebrated only upon the anniversaries of the deaths of Catholic Wittelsbachs." [1] Such was the behaviour of the curia towards the princely race which had sacrificed more on its behalf than had any other ruling family in Germany. Though King Louis had never had any affection for his stepmother, he was profoundly mortified by these slights. Those most closely associated with him were not slow to perceive that henceforward he regarded the minister with tacit suspicion.

For the present, however, he could not dispense with the aid of the powerful servant who provided him with such extensive savings on behalf of his building designs, and who exercised so efficient a control over the diet. It was a matter of mocking comment abroad that financial surpluses, which other countries ardently desired, brought sorrow to the Munich diet. The Bavarians had good ground for complaint, for their savings, estimated at twenty-nine million gulden for the years immediately preceding 1841, had been effected solely by the neglect of important branches of the administration. The state of the army was deplorable; the highways of Bavaria were in ill repute among the South German neighbours; the neglect

[1] Briefs of Gregory XVI to Bishop Peter of Augsburg, February 13; to Provost Rupert of Scheyern, July 9, 1842.

of the educational system was brought home to the astonished diet when the representatives of the three universities, Stahl, the conservative Lutheran, and Moy and Ringseis, the clericalists, were unanimous in their descriptions of the inadequacy of their respective centres of learning. Stahl spoke more boldly than the others, flatly contesting the ministry's right to dispose of the surpluses as it pleased. In punishment, Abel ordered him to surrender the chair of public law and to lecture in future upon civil law only. This contemptuous treatment made it easier for Stahl to accept a call to Prussia, but none the less the plain-spoken professor was abused by the enlightened Berliners as a man of servile spirit. The Bavarian universities declined to a yet lower level, for Abel imposed upon them a new curriculum with ill-chosen compulsory lectures and numerous intermediate examinations, whereby academic freedom was inevitably destroyed. He cherished the illusion that the arts could flourish in perpetuity where free science was unknown.

The new diet assembled in the opening days of the year 1840. At first its proceedings were peaceful, for the king had not hesitated to impress upon many of the deputies that undutiful conduct would involve his grave displeasure, whilst others among them had been intimidated by Abel's roughness.[1] As so often before, the government had refused furlough to attend the diet to a large number of state and local officials, and the central authority now went so far as to claim the right of excluding lawyers from the chamber at its discretion Not even this brought about a breach, and the thorny question of the arbitrary use made of the surpluses was removed from discussion by the sudden closure of the diet. The Protestant deputies, who comprised nearly a third of the assembly, were conciliatory, for they were unwilling that the diet should be converted into an arena for religious disputes, and they had resolved to lay the grievances of their church before the king in a special memorial.[2] The statement of grievances referred to the partisan treatment of mixed marriages, for Abel had actually declared that a pledge to bring up all the children as Catholics was compulsory at law. The document further showed that in Neuburg, Landshut, Perlach, and elsewhere,

[1] Dönhoff's Report, January 6, 1840.

[2] Dönhoff's Report, February 28; Representation from the undersigned members of the Protestant church, February, 1840.

the government had forbidden the formation of Protestant congregations, whilst meeting-houses that had been opened with official permission had subsequently been closed. In Ingolstadt the burghers, incited thereto by the Catholic clergy, had even attempted to prevent the building of a Protestant church. The minister regarded as inadmissible the very use of the term "Evangelical," stigmatising it as offensive to Catholics. This child of Wetzlar did not seem to be aware that as late as forty years back the use of the name "Catholic" had been forbidden by the imperial laws of the old regime, whereas there had been official authorisation for speaking of the "corpus evangelicorum." To crown all, this petty persecution of the Protestants had continued for years under a king who now, following the example of his Prussian brother-in-law, permitted the Catholic bishops to carry on free intercourse with the Roman see.

The greatest grievance of all, however, was that the practice of genuflexion had recently been enforced upon Protestant soldiers. This detestable innovation was doubtless the outcome of a foolish whimsy on the king's part. Louis had read the enthusiastic newspaper report of a splendid religious festival celebrated by the French troops in Algiers, and had no thought of doing anything amiss by the introduction of similar ceremonies into his own army. He did not stop to think what painful memories of Wittelsbach history such a step would inevitably recall. A hundred and twenty years earlier, Palsgrave Charles Philip had aroused intense resentment among the loyal citizens of Heidelberg by a similar piece of intolerant coercion, and as a result of the quarrel had transferred his capital to Mannheim. On the present occasion, too, ill-feeling was rife throughout the Protestant world. In the duchy of Berg, the Protestants revived their memories of Palatine days, and of the effective way in which their forefathers had ever been protected by Electoral Brandenburg. Their circle synods, led by that of Düsseldorf, began in 1839 to petition the king of Prussia to mediate with the court of Munich, but Frederick William rejected the idea as fruitless. There were serious incidents in a number of Bavarian garrisons. Not a few Protestant officers and rankers declared that to genuflect before the host would involve them in the deadly sin of "worshipping the creature." Diepenbrock and many other well-meaning Catholic priests did not hesitate to admit that right was on the side of the Protestants.

Count Carl Giech, the only Protestant among the local governors, now espoused the cause of his coreligionists, and, having received a discourteous answer from Abel, he resigned his post. Justifying his action in a respectful memorial to the king, he frankly enumerated all the errors of the Abel regime. He showed that the Protestants were beginning to question the justice of the crown; he pointed out that, owing to the way in which the surpluses were being used, the circle governments, with inadequate staffs, were unable to cope with the increasing burden of affairs; officials and teachers were in penury whilst the state treasury was filled to repletion.[1] As soon as he was free from the trammels of state service, Giech published in Würtemberg a booklet dealing with this matter of genuflexion by Protestants. Its circulation in Bavaria was at once prohibited, but it was eagerly read none the less. Subsequently he inherited from his brother, Stein's son-in-law, the mediatised territory of Thurnau. For years thenceforward he was an ornament to the Franconian nobility. At once dignified and affable, a cultured man of the world, he was, though a loyal subject, invariably plain-spoken.

The king graciously accepted the Protestant statement of grievances, but it was obvious that he considered these grievances devoid of foundation. In his view, Catholics would have occasion to congratulate themselves were they as well treated in Protestant countries as Protestants were treated in Bavaria. Abel had given him to understand that all these complaints were no more than a mask for the activities of the liberal opposition.[2] Whereas the second chamber was in almost all cases sedulous to avoid dispute, an unexpected spirit of resistance began to appear in the upper house. During twenty-five years of parliamentary life, a number of constitutionalist principles had become ingrained even in these ultra-conservative nobles. The members of the upper house complained that the discussion of the budget was a mere farce as long as the government could dispose of the surpluses as it pleased. Moreover, it was Abel's arrogant way to enunciate doctrinaire political propositions which were offensive to South German sentiment. He fulminated against the modern idea

[1] Count Carl Giech, Explanation of the Motives of my Withdrawal from the State Service, Nuremberg, September 12, 1840, lithographed; subsequently printed in General von Aster's Notes and Comments (Eilers' Saarbrücken, 1858), Vol I, p. 251.

[2] Dönhoff's Report, March 10, 1840.

of the state; he would not permit anyone to speak in his presence of the ministry of state, saying that the only ministers in Bavaria were ministers of the crown; he insisted that the Bavarian constitution was a constitution of estates, not a representative constitution, although the originators of the Bavarian constitution had known nothing of this newfangled distinction.

In the disputes arising out of such matters, Prince Oettingen-Wallerstein, Abel's predecessor in office, invariably played a part. In earlier years, when Wallerstein had been Abel's chief, Abel had written the prince letters of an extremely humble tenour;[1] but now, when Wallerstein was in disfavour at court, Abel treated him with marked discourtesy. At the final sitting of the lower house (April 10, 1840), Abel permitted himself an outburst of fury unparalleled hitherto in German constitutional assemblies. Turning Wallerstein's absence unchivalrously to account, Abel referred to the misdeeds of "this depraved individual," and made use of such abominable invectives that the members of the upper house hastened to express their indignation at the improper terms applied to their colleague. The Prussian envoy believed that this incident must infallibly lead to Abel's resignation for, he wrote, "true monarchical principles can make no headway when their defence is entrusted to religious and political hypocrisy, to one who lacks honesty and good sense, to one devoid of decency and dignity."[2] The event was other than Dönhoff had anticipated. After the dissolution of the diet, the ex-minister for religious affairs and his successor faced one another in a duel with pistols, their seconds being Gumppenberg, minister for war, and Count Rechberg. When the adversaries had exchanged shots, Abel withdrew his offensive expressions. Subsequently, however, he declared that the withdrawal had been made with certain reservations. A most unseemly correspondence ensued between these four men in high position, while the newspapers were full of detailed accounts of the ministerial duel. And this occurred in a country where the first minister was in the habit of publicly referring to the press as "a prostitute institution," and where the censorship was enforced with an iron hand. It was one of those detestable scandals which commonly precede the fall of a decayed political system.

[1] Abel to Wallerstein, January 1, 1837.
[2] Dönhoff's Report, April 12, 1840.

King Louis contented himself with expressing his personal concern to Prince Wallerstein, before witnesses. Abel remained in office as if nothing had happened.

Most deplorable was the way in which religious enmity was now everywhere manifest, so that it hampered even the king in his best undertakings. He had happy hours doubtless when the Walhalla was opened in October, 1842, the radiant Greek temple thrusting vigorously upward amid the dusky foliage of German oaks, and commanding extensive vistas of the Danubian vale. In the pediment pranked the victory of Arminius over the Romans, Schwanthaler's finest work, wherein for once the impatient sculptor had condescended to take due pains; whilst in the majestic interior were Rauch's splendid Victories, and the busts of the great ones of Germany. But Luther and Melanchthon were absent, for the Catholic king could not in the end make up his mind to admit them, although Ernst Rietschel had finished his effigy of Luther some years before, commissioned to the work by Louis himself. Thereupon a pitiable dispute broke out in newspapers and pamphlets. Most unfortunately, too, it occurred to King Louis to accompany with an elucidatory writing his costly gift to the nation. Not in vain had so many distinguished men lavished extravagant praise upon the king's verses. Even Rückert, never a flatterer, had assured the monarch that the protector of the arts was himself a favourite of the muses.

> The spokesman, poesy, of all the arts.
> Reserved for her use is the speech of men,
> And she alone makes vocal to our hearts
> What other arts in symbols have made plain.

Louis now really believed himself a distinguished author, and wrote *The Dwellers in Walhalla.* This booklet contained brief biographies of the heroes of Germany, in the tortuous lapidary style of his favourite historian Johannes Müller, but with a strong admixture of royal participial constructions. In the preface he related that as long ago as the days of the fatherland's deepest disgrace he had conceived the idea of having the fifty most notable Germans immortalised in marble. "Subsequently," he continued, "the number was increased, and was then left unrestricted, the only reservation being that the statues must represent Germans of note, feeling that it would be presumption on my part to say which were the

most noteworthy, or to maintain that there might not be other Germans, nay, more numerous Germans, worthy of commemoration, if not more worthy of commemoration, than those whom I proposed to include in my Walhalla. But the building is a commemoration of Germans of glorious reputation, and is therefore a Walhalla, in order that a German of the Germans who has visited it may when he leaves be a better man than when he entered." It was inevitable that such exercises in style should arouse the inextinguishable merriment of the press, which has ever a watchful eye for the weaknesses of the mighty. This tasteless parergon made the ungrateful Germans forget what was important and splendid in Louis' work, and they ceased to ask themselves whether in any other country in the world there was to be found such a patron of the arts, a ruler so patriotic, so magnanimous, so energetic.

From the Walhalla the king journeyed to Kehlheim, to lay the foundation-stone there, upon another rock in the Danubian valley, for a stately domed structure which was to be erected in memory of the battles of the wars of liberation. But in this extraordinary mind was to be found a singular juxtaposition of Germandom and Bavarian particularism. Hardly had he paid his dues to the greater fatherland, when he began in Munich the construction of a specifically Bavarian Walhalla, fronted by a colossal statue of Bavaria. Here all the great Franconians, Hutten, Dürer, Vischer, men who in their lifetime would never have dreamed of such an honour, were relentlessly classed as Bavarians. Indeed, we should be taking no greater liberty with German history were we to speak to-day of "Goethe, the Prussian." Thus the liberal world could always find fresh matter for cheap mockery. In Munich, the monuments to the elector Maximilian and to Tilly were unveiled with rash speeches which aroused much discontent, for it was inadmissible, in a parity state, that anyone should use such language as the king used in his references to the gloomy days of the wars of religion.

Louis continued to deceive himself as to the sentiments of his country and as to those of his own heart. He had not the remotest thought of abandoning the benign principles of his beloved teacher Bishop Sailer; indeed, he expressly declared to the new bishop of Ratisbon, "It is my desire that you should above all imitate Sailer." Yet he obstinately insisted upon the strict observance of the harsh regulations

concerning genuflexion, with some trifling mitigations which earned thanks from no one. Matters reached such a pitch that a dean named Redtenbacher printed an appeal to the consciences of Protestant soldiers, enlightening them as to the sinfulness of papistical ceremonies. The indomitable pastor was sentenced by the courts, but the king had to extend his clemency, so strong was the ill-feeling aroused among the Protestants. Meanwhile the monks and the nuns, who now thronged the schools and charitable institutions, were devoting their best energies to the saving of youthful souls, and with such success that a number of schoolchildren together with several pupils of the Munich home for the blind desired to be received into the Roman church. The clergy accepted all these young people without hesitation, although the edict of religions which was appended to the constitution expressly forbade the proselytising of minors. Abel arrogantly declared that the prohibition conflicted with natural liberty of conscience, and with the concordat. Thus heedlessly, and in a peculiarly undesirable connection, did he revive the ancient and still unsettled dispute, which took precedence, the concordat or the constitution. Should the minister's view prevail, the Protestant church of Bavaria would be deprived of its legal status.

No less conspicuous was the partisanship of the government when the Gustavus Adolphus Union attempted to establish branches in Bavaria. This organisation had been founded some years earlier, after the great commemorative festival upon the battlefield of Lützen, whilst from 1841 onwards, when a special appeal had been issued by Zimmermann, the Darmstadt prelate, it had been more richly supplied with funds. It was especially designed to aid Protestants in nonprotestant lands, to help them to found new churches and congregations, and thus, in accordance with the spirit of Protestantism, freely and modestly to counteract the gigantic forces of Roman Catholic propaganda. Since the above-mentioned appeal emanated from the circles of the liberal theologians, and received its most effective support from Superintendent Grossmann of Leipzig, another divine of the same way of thinking, the orthodox were at first inclined to regard the union with suspicion. Hengstenberg, with his wonted fanaticism, termed it a gigantic lie. In actual fact, during recent decades, practically all the manifestations of Protestant activity had issued

from the straight-laced sections, and these first stirrings of religious energy among the theologians of less rigid views were quite unprecedented phenomena. King Frederick William, too, was suspicious for a long time, but he came in the end to realise that the Gustavus Adolphus Union honestly designed to summon all parties in the Protestant church to combine for joint good works. He therefore allowed himself to be named protector of the foundation in Prussia. It is true that he took occasion to assure his Catholic territorial bishops that no hostility to the Roman church was implied—a step which many good Protestants, including the loyal Anton Stolberg, regarded as a sign of unkingly weakness. Henceforward, however, the development of the union proceeded apace. By vigorous support to coreligionists in difficult situations, the fatherland of the reformation gave an appropriate answer to the encroachments of the Roman see.

Unfortunately the name of the Gustavus Adolphus foundation was not happily chosen. Disintegrated nations, longing for unity, are apt to display a morbidly irritable national feeling. They form unjust judgments regarding historical events, for the simple reason that they are subject to extraneous authority; and they fail to recognise that every civilised race in Europe, not excepting the island race of the English, has had its development favoured at one time or another by the intervention of great aliens. Widely diffused at this epoch was an utterly unhistorical view of the Thirty Years' War, an outlook which found its literary expression in the historical treatises of Gfrörer and Barthold. The struggle between the Guelphs and the Ghibellines was transferred into the age of the wars of religion, and the defenders of Protestantism were condemned as rebels against emperor and empire. It was natural that this pseudo-Ghibelline conception of history should be congenial to the ardent admirer of the elector Maximilian. The mere name of the Gustavus Adolphus Union sufficed to convince King Louis that the aims of the organisation were frankly treasonable, whilst the ultramontanes spoke of it as "the monstrous issue of the enlightenment and of German disunity." In Bavaria the Union was strictly prohibited. The Evangelical congregations were not permitted to receive any assistance from it, whilst the Roman Catholic proselytisers were allowed to continue their activities unchecked.

The inevitable outcome of such gross and persistent

injustice was a decomposition of the old parties. The Franconian Protestants, whose inclinations had been strongly conservative, all passed over into the camp of the embittered opposition. In Erlangen the rationalism of earlier days had been counteracted by the revivalist sermons and the practical piety of Krafft, and had subsequently been utterly routed by Lehmus, Harless, Höfling, Thomasius, and other newly appointed professors of theology. There now prevailed in the theological faculty a rigidly Lutheran sentiment. The men of Erlangen had been such obstinate opponents of the Evangelical union, that the reproach of proprussianism, which the minister was fond of hurling at the Protestants, was here especially inapplicable. At the same time they showed a serious love of learning, and remained entirely free from pietist hypocrisy. The little university was distinguished, as it had ever been, for the vigorous, unpretentious, and cheerful character of its student life. The long-suffering Lutherans had an ingrained veneration for authority, but they were exasperated by Abel's manifest infringements of the constitution, and they regarded themselves henceforward as "in statu confessionis." Just as in the days of the Augsburg interim the ultra-orthodox inhabitants of Jena had displayed more power of resistance than the pupils of the gentle Melanchthon, so now did the Bavarian Protestants find their most effective supports in the narrow and steadfast literalism of the Erlangen theologians. They were joined in their resistance by the equally conservative nobles, first of all by Count Giech and Baron von Rotenhan; subsequently by the Nurembergers, who were beginning to recall the days of the imperial cities and of their struggles against their Catholic neighbours in Bavaria; and in the end by the whole of Protestant Franconia.

Since Stahl's departure, Erlangen university had been represented in the diet by Harless, editor of the rigidly Lutheran *Zeitschrift für Protestantismus und Kirche*, an able and experienced professor, no less active in the pulpit than in the parliamentary chamber. In 1839, at an apt moment, he had published his *Jesuitenspiegel* [Jesuit Code], a plain account of the moral casuistry of the Society of Jesus, based upon unimpeachable authorities, and therefore extremely distasteful to the ultramontanes. The Protestant general synods of Ansbach and Baireuth now endeavoured, more than once, to lay the grievances of their church before the throne. Abel

contested their right to adopt this course, and, by a purely arbitrary exercise of his powers, instructed the royal commissaries to forbid such proceedings. The two synods thereupon met in joint conference, and by a unanimous vote decided to send their petitions to the monarch in person.

Meanwhile the dispute had been continued in the literary field. Harless, Thiersch, and the other Protestant champions, confident in the strength of their position, continued to exhibit a certain moderation. The clericalists, on the other hand, were not slow to adopt the tone which had been customary in the sultry days before the Thirty Years' War. They maintained (and the contention sounded like mockery in the mouths of devout Catholics) that genuflexion was a mere salutation, a bodily movement devoid of significance if the genuflector did not choose to attach any meaning thereto. Especially distinguished by priestly intolerance was Johann Döllinger, who since Möhler's death had been the leading mind in the theological faculty of Munich. A man of penetrating and yet narrow intelligence, no one could at this date anticipate the numerous transformations his views were to undergo. In his polemic writings against Harless, he declared that he, too, had diligently studied the works of the Wittenberg reformers, "but never without having recourse to such means of spiritual prophylaxis as we are accustomed to use in the bodily sphere when we are compelled to pick our way through a contaminated area or a fœtid morass." He looked upon the evangelical freedom of the Protestants as utter folly. He referred contemptuously to their "pitiful church," which dreaded the secession of minors, which had nothing more solid to build upon than scripture, and which, split into countless factions, could maintain the affirmative and the negative with equal confidence. After this paper warfare and a few violent scenes in the chamber, Harless was suddenly transferred to Baireuth as ecclesiastical councillor, to make it impossible for him to represent Erlangen any longer in the diet. No attention being paid to his protests, he resigned, and accepted a summons to Leipzig. Whither could such a partisan regime lead, a regime unable to endure the presence of opponents like Stahl and Harless?

The increasing discontent of the Franconians ultimately forced Roth, president of the supreme consistory at Munich, and the most conservative of all the Bavarian Lutherans, to

join in the affray. An able and learned Swabian, permeated with the classical culture of his native province, he had done much to promote the revival of Erlangen university; whilst in the Franconian school system, when the crudely rationalist Stephani had ceased to be inspector of schools, Roth had helped to reawaken a vigorous religious life. Of late he had earnestly endeavoured to induce the Palatine united church, in whose charter of union holy writ was stated to be the sole basis of faith and sole rule of doctrine, to agree to the formal recognition of the symbolical books as well. This undertaking involved him in a fresh dispute with his old opponent Paulus, and success was impossible without constraint of conscience, for rationalism continued to dominate the congregations of the Palatinate. Thus unceasingly at war with the children of the enlightenment, he was infected with a disastrous error which is commoner in the north than in the comparatively well-informed south, for he came to regard the ultramontanes as his natural allies in the struggle against unbelief. The king conferred signal marks of distinction upon this deserving official; Abel had always to placate him; and the Prussian envoy noted with pain how much injustice the supreme consistory was willing to tolerate from the clericalists.[1] At length, however, Roth's eyes were opened, and having once realised that his church was being oppressed, he defended its rights with prudence and resolution. Through his instrumentality the worst grievance of the Protestants was redressed, for after he had sent a plain-spoken letter to the king, the genuflexion order, which had several times been modified, was finally cancelled in December, 1845. For seven years, however, Protestant consciences had been needlessly outraged. In the long run this dispute turned to the advantage of the Protestant church in Bavaria. Fidelity to the faith had strengthened the sense of unity; many indifferents had been regained for the active life of religion; respect had been enforced even from opponents. When the waters of the ultramontane flood had subsided, in Bavaria no less than elsewhere the relationships between the churches became exceedingly friendly.

Meanwhile the diet of 1842 had run its course without any violent storms. The deputies had uttered complaints concerning the king's costly building operations, concerning the neglect of the schools, and concerning the niggardliness of the government,

[1] Dönhoff's Reports, January 2, 1840, and subsequent dates.

which left numerous important posts unoccupied, and made a practice of superannuating officials before the close of the fiftieth year of service in order to avoid having to pay them full pensions. Nevertheless the acrimonious dispute over the surpluses was once more shelved by the king's personal intervention. Louis considered himself to be merely exercising his sovereign rights in disposing of the savings at his own discretion. After he had expressed this view on several occasions, he wrote to a confidant: "Since it is impracticable for me to give audience to all the deputies devoted to my cause, I write to you, Auerweck, who are one of the most devoted among the number, in order that you may let the others read my message, that they may take action just as if I had spoken to each personally. *The matter is settled.*"[1] This sufficed, and the diet departed in peace. Almost immediately afterwards, the capital was troubled by some street rioting, but this was occasioned solely by the high price of beer. There was only one ground for anxiety, in that the soldiers were likewise affected with the tribal thirst, and consequently showed undue indulgence to the mob.

More serious indications were now forthcoming that the government no longer stood on a firm footing. The king's popularity was a thing of the past. The lower middle classes railed against his building mania, and against his reiterated visits to Italy; whilst the parsimoniousness of the administration and the incessant religious disputes were further sources of dissatisfaction. More than once an impudent parody of the Lord's prayer was pasted upon the door of St. Louis' church, addressed to the father of Bavaria, and running: "Deliver us from the evil of thy person." When Abel proposed to the council of state that the king should publicly announce his displeasure with the Protestant synods, the minister, hitherto all-powerful, was no longer able to have his way. The learned Maurer, his friend of the old Greek days, decisively opposed the suggestion. So did the crown prince, whom the ultramontanes secretly detested owing to his Prussian marriage and owing to his relationships with North German scholars. Even Prince Luitpold, a strict Catholic, insisted that there must be no infringement of the rights of the Protestants.[2] The king thereupon took alarm. He prided himself upon his sense of

[1] King Louis to the deputy Auerweck, undated (end of March, 1842).
[2] Report from the minister resident von Küster, February 28, 1845.

justice, and he was overheard to say: "Abel has become impossible."

In December of this same year, 1845, the newly elected diet assembled, and from the first showed a more contentious spirit than its predecessor. It is true that the address of the lower house contained a fervent assurance, "it is the Bavarians' pride to be subjects of such a king." The Ludovican lapidary style was contagious, and its imitation was customary at court. But Baron von Rotenhan, the Franconian Protestant, was elected president; and since Abel had refused furlough to seven Protestant deputies, violent scenes occurred from the very outset. The opposition was led by two liberal aristocrats, Thon-Dittmer and Max von Lerchenfeld, resolute men endowed with exceptional oratorical gifts. The fiercest attacks upon the minister were, however, made in the upper house. Although the composition of this chamber was almost exclusively Catholic, anxiety had been aroused among its members by the excessive favour displayed towards the religious orders. There were now at least one hundred and thirty-two monasteries and nunneries in the country, belonging to twenty-three different orders, nine for men and fourteen for women. The nuns gave little cause for anxiety, although the teaching sisters were apt to make themselves a nuisance by their proselytising efforts. Among the monks, the Benedictines enjoyed great prestige. In days of yore they had been affiliated with the Scottish monks of St. Columba, and like these latter had on German soil continued to manifest German sentiments. The brethren who had recently been summoned from Austria did their utmost to perfect their somewhat scanty classical culture, and supplied reasonably good instruction at the higher schools entrusted to their care. More dubious were the activities of the monks belonging to the enigmatic "third order" of St. Francis. Still more open to question were the doings of the Redemptorists, affiliated to the Society of Jesus, and permitted to continue their missionary labours undisturbed, although, despite the ever-renewed requests of the clericalists, the king steadfastly refused to grant permission for the return of the Jesuits proper.

Prince Wrede, son of the field-marshal, a man of evil reputation and heavily burdened with debt, now compiled a formal statement of these and many other grievances against the government, and laid the document before the upper house.

Writing to the king, he said that Abel had gone far to deprive Louis of the affection of the majority of his subjects. Prince Wallerstein imagined that the moment had arrived for him to gain the saddle once more. In a cunningly calculated and emotionally worded speech, he termed himself the most ultramontane of the ultramontanes and the most devoted of the king's subjects, going on to suggest what was ostensibly a proposal of intermediation, but was really designed to bring about Abel's fall. The proposal was that the government should not admit any religious orders whose activities tended to endanger religious peace. In a letter to the king's friend, Baron von der Tann, he warned Louis of the "approaching European crises"; it would no longer do, he said, to look upon differences of opinion as being necessarily indications of enmity.[1] Wallerstein's proposal was accepted by the upper house with no more than six dissentients, the crown prince voting for it, and even speaking on its behalf.

In his extremity, Abel had recourse to demagogic measures. Through the instrumentality of the officials under his command, he had the Catholic populace incited to action, nor was it long before addresses began to reach the palace from every corner of the land, expressing gratitude to the government for its justice, and affirming confidence in the future. The king, who was loath to break with the minister, was at first gratified by these testimonials, writing to the Augsburgers: "Accustomed as I am not infrequently to gross ingratitude, the thanks of Augsburg's Catholic burghers is all the more pleasing to me seeing that I protect both Catholics and Protestants in their constitutional rights." But the addresses continued to roll in, and their clericalist impudence exceeded all bounds. A petition from Munich bluntly declared that "every Bavarian" demanded freedom for his Catholic church, which had sacrificed blood and possessions for his ancestors. The Protestants, it seemed, were no longer to be accounted Bavarians. Even more unrestrained was the wording of the innumerable pamphlets which were all at once published "against the new foes of the church and against the stormers of the monasteries." The sources of these pamphlets were variously described: "From the Bavarian forest"; "From a Bavarian Catholic"; "From a parish priest in the diocese of Eichstädt"—and so

[1] Prince Ludwig von Wallerstein to Baron von der Tann, January 19, 1846.

on. To sample the contents: "The Catholic church in Bavaria is half a millennium older than the house of Wittelsbach"; or again, "Do not forget that the largest and most vigorous portion of the Bavarian people is ready to take up arms on behalf of the Roman church!" Höfler, by no means the most fanatical amongst the clericalists, writing anent Wrede's proposal, said that whereas many of the high-born members of the upper house seemed to imagine that monks were out of date, the popular opinion rather was that nobles were out of date. Replying to the reproach that the Redemptorists were disturbers of religious peace, Höfler scornfully declared that this peace had been destroyed long ago, with Luther's advent. Thus convulsively, and with the use of terrorist threats, did this party, foreseeing its impending overthrow, endeavour to cling to power. To the king it became a pressing question whether his house could possibly rely for support upon clericalist jacobins, and he forbade the sending in of any more addresses.

Thereupon the clericalists in the diet advanced to the attack. No longer satisfied with the persistent success of the clergy in evading the legal ban upon the proselytising of minors, they now demanded that the prohibition should be withdrawn. Gebsattel, the veteran archbishop of Munich, was induced by Windischmann, the pugnacious vicar general, to support this proposal. Shortly before his death the kindly disposed archbishop published a solemn protest, wherein he referred to the miracles of the saintly children Vitus and Agnes, going on to draw as a logical conclusion that since the concordat recognised the "vigens ecclesiæ disciplina," the reception of children must be permitted. The king was disquieted afresh by this arrogant attempt to give the concordat precedence over the constitution. The ultramontanes were unable to impose their wishes upon the chamber. Nor were the liberals intimidated when Döllinger, now the most impassioned spokesman of the governmental party, accused them of revolutionary designs. They perceived that the dawn was at hand, and were once again venturing to introduce proposals for freedom of the press and publicity of judicial procedure. The turbulent session was brought to a close in May, 1846, by the well-tried expedient of the abrupt dissolution of the diet. But the unrest in the country persisted, and Count Bernstorff reported in melancholy mood that matters had

reached an impossible pass.[1] The king had the same feeling, and was already preparing for a change of system. Gise, minister for foreign affairs, and Schrenck, minister for justice, both incompetent, were dismissed. For the time being, Gumppenberg retained the post of minister for war, although the utter lack of discipline in the crowded Munich barracks afforded daily proof of the unconscientious way in which the military administration was neglecting its duties.

It was an additional sign of the times that Friedrich Rohmer, who had often ere this been seen in the Austrian ambassadorial circle, now declared war against the ultramontanes. A strange dreamer, a compost of philosopher and adventurer, with an intelligence half brilliant and half disordered, Rohmer announced himself to be the greatest figure in human history. He led an errant life in South Germany and in Switzerland, invariably attended by a small circle of youthful admirers, who were unable to withstand his despotic influence, or to resist the elemental lure of his singular appearance, and who combined to keep their spendthrift mentor in funds. He brooded over the details of a nebulous system of psychology, and over those of a political doctrine wherein, in accordance with the old folly of the nature philosophers, the state was regarded as a kind of magnified human body. Amid much clotted nonsense, his writing *Concerning the Four Parties* contained here and there an excellent idea. Little attention was paid to it, and the only result of its publication was that J. C. Bluntschli, the Swiss jurist, and the most distinguished of Rohmer's disciples, strayed for a season in the byways of fantasy. At times, nevertheless, from the luxuriant overgrowth of his theories Rohmer emerged into the light of day, and he would then, strangely enough, display a secure political instinct, a happy talent for seeing things in broad outline and for depicting them in vivid portraiture. *Materials for the History of Recent Politics*, the work he now published, subjected the intrigues of the Bavarian ultramontanes to pitiless scrutiny. The influence of the book was all the more powerful because the author was reckoned a conservative.

Towards the close of the year 1846, King Louis at length came to realise that the other ministers were of little account and that Abel's ecclesiastical policy was the sole cause of the general discontent. In December the management of public

[1] Bernstorff's Report, June 13, 1846.

worship and education was taken out of the hands of the minister for home affairs, and was entrusted to Carl von Schrenck, a moderate conservative, minister for justice, successor in this latter post to his father Sebastian von Schrenck. The change was the beginning of the end. Had the king advanced further along this road, had he of his own free political choice completely swept away the ministry which had long outlived its usefulness and which was so universally detested, the fall of the ultramontane partisan regime, which the ultramontanes would have brought upon themselves, would have redounded to the advantage of Germany at large. But sinister influences were at work, and this government, heavy as were its sins, had the undeserved good fortune of making a worthy exit from the stage, haloed in sublime moral indignation.

Whilst the clericalists ruled in Bavaria, there began in Baden a secular reactionary regime, at least friendly to the clericalists, and indirectly favourable to their ends. It was not yet possible for a circumscribed ultramontane party to constitute itself in the grand duchy, although the Catholic clergy of all the south-west had a secret place of assembly at Neuburg Abbey, near Heidelberg, under the hospitable roof of Frau Schlosser. In the diet, moreover, at any rate in the upper house, there were always to be found a few members of strongly Romanist leanings. Most of the officials and the majority of cultured laymen were still wholly swayed by the principles of the Josephan religious policy, whilst among the older clerics there were numerous supporters of Wessenberg's ideas, and even men who cherished yet bolder plans of ecclesiastical reform. In 1831 no less than one hundred and sixty clerks in holy orders had signed the petition for the abolition of celibacy. Recently, under the leadership of Dean Kuenzer, a liberal, there had come into existence the Schaffhausen Union, by which religious questions were discussed with unwonted freedom. In accordance with the Protestant example, this body demanded that in the Catholic church, too, there should be mixed synods of priests and laymen. Of late, however, a clergy with more distinctively Romanist sentiments had been growing up. It was the tragical fate of the governments of Baden and Würtemberg that in their loyal care for the Catholic faculties of the territorial universities they should have trained up enemies against themselves. Hirscher and

the other Freiburg professors were by no means ultramontane in sentiment. But the young clerics whom they taught possessed more theological knowledge and more feeling for the church than had characterised the older generation, and for these reasons they had a more priestly outlook. In the good old times, the bureaucracy had exercised over the church a sway which had now become intolerable; and here, as everywhere in Germany, the troubles in Cologne had encouraged the clergy to advance new claims.

In the diet, Baron von Andlaw seized several opportunities of drawing attention to the needs of the Roman church. In 1841 the growing ultramontane party gave its first indication of vigorous life by the publication of an anonymous pamphlet entitled *Catholic Conditions in Baden.* The author was Mone, director of the archives, though the fact did not transpire during his lifetime. A learned and prolific writer, well known to historians for his facile hypotheses, Mone implied in this pamphlet that the Catholic majority of the Badenese people suffered oppression at the hands of the Protestant officials of the Protestant dynasty. It is true that "the Durlachers" (the term is still current to denote the official families in the former Protestant margravate of Baden-Durlach) were strongly represented in the higher offices of state, for the Catholic nobles of the highland regions commonly sent their sons into the Austrian service. But the good-natured grand duke had never a thought of showing any favouritism towards the Protestants. Though the Badenese authorities kept a suspicious watch upon the catechisms, the hymn books, and the fasting regulations of the Catholic church, the Evangelicals were subjected to an equally strict supervision. The omniscient zeal for tutelage arose out of the very nature of the police state, and the old doctrine in accordance with which the clergy were merely state servants still universally prevailed. At the instigation of Reizenstein, the veteran minister, Nebenius wrote an effective answer to Mone's plaints, but the seed of discord had been sown broadcast, and the church began to assume the ever grateful role of suffering martyr.

Minister Blittersdorff, being an adherent of Austria, and the sworn enemy of Prussia, naturally had ultramontane leanings, and he was in close confidential correspondence with Abel. For his immediate purposes, however, other means were requisite. By the unscrupulous utilisation of his bureaucratic

authority, he hoped to reestablish what he termed the monarchical system, to enforce a silent obedience upon the officialdom, and to annihilate the opposition in the diet. "I shall," he said in plain terms, "do all that I can in this direction." Neither the grand duke nor Blittersdorff's colleagues in the ministry had complete trust in the arrogant man, but they were browbeaten by his serene self-confidence; and since in accordance with the correct Viennese doctrine every German court was responsible to the Federation for the good behaviour of its chambers, it was within the competence of the minister for foreign affairs to supervise the entire conduct of the administration. Blittersdorff's attitude towards the deputies was one of cavalier insolence, which contrasted unpleasantly with Winter's middle-class geniality. He made no attempt to conceal that, accustomed as he was to the sublime affairs of the Bundestag, he regarded with contempt the pettyfogging proceedings of the Badenese diet. This was extremely mortifying, for in no other German state was the constitution in such high popular esteem as in Baden, nowhere else was the self-satisfaction of the deputies so lively. Since the officialdom and the estates vied with one another in their efforts to confer happiness upon the people, the diet of Baden was summoned at frequent intervals, almost every year, and the sessions were long drawn out. The suffrage was comparatively unrestricted, and even among the common people the doings of the chamber were followed with eager attention. After the debates upon the foundation of the customs union, pipes were on sale in the Black Forest fairs whereon were inscribed the votes of the representatives of the people. Throughout Baden, Rotteck's death was lamented as a national calamity. The liberal newspapers were unanimous in describing him as the most popular man of the century. On his tombstone was inscribed the verse from Schiller: "He has passed away, and all the joy of life, too, passes in a sigh!" The hatred of his opponents was no less unbounded than the admiration of his devotees. When the men of the uplands wished to erect a statue to their noted compatriot, King Louis of Bavaria would not allow Schwanthaler to undertake the commission. "Rotteck does not deserve a statue," said the monarch; "he deserves a whipping-post." Thus by friend and foe alike was nourished what Welcker spoke of as "the great Badenese idea," the idea, namely, that among German

states the liberal exemplar was to be found along the upper reaches of the Rhine.

The pride of this institution for popular representation, which really believed itself to stand in the foremost ranks of time, seemed insufferable to the government, were it only because nearly half the members of the lower house were persons in the state service. The Badenese officials had in any case strong leanings towards independence, and with the added leverage of a parliamentary position they might well succeed in gaining the upper hand over their official superiors. Blittersdorff consequently resolved to take the bull by the horns, and when the chambers reassembled in 1841 he had furlough refused to two officials among those reelected. His action involved no breach of law, for the constitution did not anywhere specify that state servants entering the chambers could dispense with furlough. Twenty years earlier, the government had for peace' sake withdrawn certain refusals of furlough, and had not in the interim renewed these petty tactics; but the right of refusal had never been formally renounced.[1] But the use and wont of years could not be abolished so readily. The lower house, to which the aid of expert liberal officials seemed indispensable, felt that the very foundations of its power were imperilled, and declared that the withholding of furlough was absolutely unconstitutional. Thereupon Blittersdorf induced the grand duke to take action. The chambers were prorogued, and Leopold issued a manifesto wherein he deplored the errors of the lower house, but expressed the hope that sounder views would speedily prevail. Beyond question the grand duke was entitled to issue such a message, which contained no legislative prescription. Were it otherwise, he would no longer have possessed any vestige of monarchical authority. But by the dominant theories of the law of reason it was taken as a settled matter that the sovereign could not express his will about anything whatever except through the instrumentality of his ministers. A terrible clamour consequently arose, and when the diet reassembled at the new year of 1842, old Itzstein and the wrathful Welcker brought up their heavy artillery. Amid thunderous acclamations from the galleries, the grand duke's manifesto was likewise stigmatised as unconstitutional.

The dissolution of the diet was the only possible rejoinder,

[1] See vol. III, p. 359, and vol. V, pp. 165 et seq.

and Blittersdorff now believed he had won the game. Never before had Germany witnessed such an electoral struggle as the one that ensued in Baden. Its consequences were long lasting, being displayed in the morbid embitterment of party life, and above all in the unprincipled action of the officials, most of whom slavishly complied with the orders of the detested minister, thus losing power to withstand in the future the forces of revolution. All possible evil arts of official threats, browbeatings, and bribes were utilised; whilst the opposition countered with similar weapons. Mannheim and Constance were the chief opposition strongholds. From Mannheim, Itzstein issued his instructions to the liberal spokesmen; from Constance, Josef Fickler influenced the highland peasants by the demagogic articles of his *Seeblätter*. All this commotion because the grand duke had refused furlough to two officials, and had subsequently issued a sovereign address to his subjects! But the real cause of the widespread resentment lay deeper, for the common people had an obscure conviction that Blittersdorff was in truth aiming at a modification of the constitution, and that he looked for help, should need arise, from the Bundestag. No sober-minded observer of the fierce toil of this electoral campaign could fail to foresee that revolution was imminent.

The liberals were completely victorious, thus regaining for the first time after the lapse of many years a safe majority in the lower house, a majority which had to engage in a life or death struggle with its enemies. "Father Itzstein" had justified his popular nickname, for he had begotten a numerous progeny for his party. The recognised champions of liberalism were now joined by Sander, the jurist, known to his intimates as "Marat"; by Bassermann, the Mannheim bookseller, a warm-hearted representative of the cultured and well-to-do middle classes, who owed his reputation for radicalism solely to the reckless outspokenness of his speeches; and finally by Carl Mathy, who towered above all the others. Acquitted at long last, Mathy had relinquished his tranquil occupation as schoolmaster in Switzerland, to return to his old home. In governmental circles he was looked upon as the worst of demagogues. He would rise deliberately from his seat, would turn his quiet blue eyes full upon the ministerial benches, and would then launch his reproaches with polished irony, which cut far deeper than Welcker's stormy indignation. But

his was the solitary statesmanlike intelligence in the ranks of the opposition. He possessed the moderation that springs from comprehensive knowledge. Renouncing phrase-making, he spoke ever to the point, and only when his words were likely to be effective. His favourite topic was finance.

Thanks to the savage onslaught made by Blittersdorff, Badenese liberalism was again enabled to enjoy a blossoming time such as had been known once before in the great diet of 1831. It availed the ministers nothing that at the outset they determined to hold aloof from the sittings of the new diet, hoping that the opposition would merely make itself ridiculous by fulminating invectives against the empty governmental benches. The course was looked upon by all the world as a sign of weakness. Mathy's widely circulated newspaper, the *Lantagszeitung*, published detailed and carefully penned reports of the proceedings, and these reports found their way into the remotest villages of the Black Forest. The quidnuncs came even from Würtemberg and from the Bavarian Palatinate. The chamber was a theatre, and the audience joined in the play. What fun it was when the president had the thronged galleries cleared because of noisy interruptions, and when, upon the demand of a liberal deputy, the sovereign people was readmitted to resume its clamour. Ladies were sitting on the steps of the presidential dais and there were other visitors in the middle of the hall, when Bassermann was calling to account the absent ministers, "the servants of the people"; when angry orators were sedulously washing the dirty linen of the last electoral campaign; when the defenders of the government could bring forward nothing but unprofitable words; and when finally the majority, upon Itzstein's motion, passed a well-deserved vote of censure upon the ministry. The vote had no legal significance, seeing that the upper house rejected it, but it went home to Grand Duke Leopold. He realised that the country was unanimous in the cry, Away with Blittersdorff, and yet he felt it would touch his princely honour to yield to the pressure of the estates. Blittersdorff remained in office, without deigning to visit the diet; and in natural dudgeon, the liberals continued to utter angry speeches embodying the leading desires of the day, freedom of the press, trial by jury, and curtailment of police powers. Some of the more advanced radicals were already inclining to voice aspirations

which far outstripped the aims of the liberal leaders, but Itzstein's diplomacy and fatherly ways enabled him to keep these hotspurs within bounds. One of the radicals was Friedrich Hecker, an ill-mannered braggart. Another was Burgomaster Baum, who declared that since the nobleman sentenced to the penitentiary forfeited his nobility, it would be only logical if the middle-class criminal were to be degraded into the nobility. When the diet was prorogued in September, the embittered opposition would not take part in the formalities of the closing sitting, so that, as Radowitz, the Prussian envoy, reported in melancholy mood: "The diet came to an end amid the acclamations of a very few, the silence of a large number, and the harassing doubts of the majority.[1]

None the less, the great speeches of this sterile diet aroused enthusiastic delight throughout the liberal world. Robert Prutz sent three congratulatory lays *To Baden's Lower House.* One of them ran as follows:

> The Itzstein and the Welcker
> Now boldly lead the fray.
> The peoples rise from slumber
> To greet the coming day.

In Baden itself there was no end to banquets and meetings. The members of the opposition made so adroit a use of all opportunities for public celebrations that even the church festivals of the highlands were almost put into the shade. Welcker had shortly before been reappointed professor at Freiburg. Now, to the supreme delight of Metternich,[2] he was again arbitrarily dismissed his post. He removed to Heidelberg. In his villa on the other bank of the Neckar, across the red stone bridge, in the very place where of old had stood the Roman temple to Mithra, the liberals were wont to assemble for grave deliberations. More lively were the proceedings in Hallgarten, where Itzstein passed his summer holidays. Here, and in the vicinity, the wine flowing freely, the Badenese liberals foregathered with those from Nassau and Hesse. At one of the Rhine valley festivities, the inevitable Hoffmann of Fallersleben voiced his *Welcome Father Itzstein,* an ode which speedily made the round of South Germany, so

[1] Radowitz' Report, September 10, 1842.

[2] Metternich, Instruction to Trauttmansdorff, October 19; Otterstedt's Report, November 6, 1841.

naïvely did it reflect the garrulous sentimentality of the day:

> Let us openly acknowledge,
> With manly pride fulfilled,
> Troubles all and errors,
> As thou hast ever willed!
> Fatherland, be joyful,
> For look, how clear the night!
> Our guiding star, our Itzstein,
> Sheds near and far his light!

At the jubilee commemoration of the Badenese constitution, which took place in the year 1843, the government was so incredibly foolish as to shun all official participation, with the result that the celebrations took the form of a noisy triumph for the opposition. Father Itzstein despatched his orators to every town in the land. He himself went to Griesbach, where the fundamental law had been signed five and twenty years earlier, and the peasants acclaimed him everywhere as protector of the country's rights. The festal speeches (which, under Mathy's editorship, were subsequently published in a bulky tome) and the cheers for the constitution sounded like a menacing battle-cry directed against Blittersdorff.

To the general misfortune, the political dispute was further envenomed by the occurrence of an abominable scandal at court. Moritz von Haber, the notorious Carlist agent, prodigal son of Salomon Haber, banker to the court, had recently returned home after prolonged residence in foreign parts, where he had undergone a series of conversions, from Judaism to Catholicism, and from Catholicism to Protestantism. Astonishment was universal when, shortly after his return, he wormed himself into the confidence of Grand Duchess Sophia, a proud and talented woman. The monetary affairs of her unhappy brother, the prince of Vasa, received from Haber the aid of an expert. He was closely associated with the house of Rothschild, and also with Benazet, a man of evil reputation, farmer of the gaming-house in Baden-Baden. He was likewise on intimate terms with Blittersdorff, who loved venturesome financial speculations. The grand duke and his brothers regarded the crafty adventurer with well-grounded suspicion. The dissensions at court soon became widely known, and the gossip-loving capital buzzed with marvellous tales concerning Haber's profligacy and concerning his reactionary designs. He was spoken of as the curse of the country. Baden-Baden society closed its doors

upon Haber, who consequently challenged a lieutenant named von Göler. A court of honour decided that an officer could not meet such a man as the challenger. Thereupon a Russian of good standing took Haber's place, and in the ensuing duel Göler and the Russian were both killed. The news of this affair inflamed the wrath of the populace, the old hatred of the Jews being doubtless a contributory cause. The Carlsruhe mob wrecked the Haber banking house. The police did little to interfere, whilst the troops did not appear upon the scene until the mischief had been done, and it was manifest that a powerful party at court approved the chastisement of the grand duchess' confidant.[1] The government was at its wits' end, and in its alarm forbade the newspapers to make any reference to these shameful incidents. With devastating scorn Mathy subsequently showed in the diet how grossly the government had offended, first by its weakness, and subsequently by its severity. He prophesied that this carnival of political wisdom would be followed by an Ash Wednesday. Nor was this all. A half-pay officer named Uria-Sarachaja determined to revenge his fallen comrade, writing to Haber an open letter couched in terms so offensive that a second duel became inevitable. Haber shot his antagonist, and took refuge in flight from a third duel which was about to be forced upon him. There ensued a fresh outburst of popular indignation, so that even the street minstrels at the fairs sang the gruesome story of the three victims. In the Rhenish press, however, the favourite of the house of Rothschild had a number of stalwart defenders.

While these affairs were still in progress, Blittersdorff had at length realised that it was impossible for him to remain in the hostile land. In November, 1843, he returned to Frankfort as federal envoy, to resume there his philaustrian policy. His regime in Baden and Abel's in Bavaria had given the South Germans a wholesome experience of what was to be expected from government by clericalist or semi-clericalist partisans. But Blittersdorff's withdrawal came too late, for discontent now exceeded bounds. Boeckh, minister for finance, who stepped into Blittersdorff's place, was unable, despite his knowledge and ability, to restore the prestige of the government.

The grand duke, in his perplexity, sought advice on all hands. He secured no effective help from the Prussian court.

[1] Radowitz' Reports, September 6 and 11, 1843.

The king had recalled Otterstedt, a man well versed in South German affairs, and had commissioned Radowitz to take charge of the affairs of the Carlsruhe embassy in conjunction with his duties at Frankfort. This was another almost inconceivable blunder. Radowitz was totally ignorant of conditions in the south, and was not even in a position to regard them with an unprejudiced eye, for at this time he still cherished strongly clericalist views, and was on friendly terms with Mone and with Mone's backers. By the force of his personality he speedily secured a firm footing at the Badenese court. The grand duke frequently paid him private visits, and when the Prussian was at Frankfort, Leopold would write to him, or send verbal enquiries through Krieg, the aide-de-camp. The responses were invariably gentle and tranquil. Radowitz issued warnings against any attempt at a coup d'état; he encouraged the alarmed prince to hold out when the latter spoke of abdicating; and he did not conceal his opinion that Blittersdorff was a man of sinister influence. But he never came to understand the significance of the constitution to Baden. The bureaucratic-constitutionalist political life of the south repelled him. He looked upon "the transformation of German princely dominions into modern sovereignties" as the source of all ills. It therefore seemed to him essential that the constitution should be modified in certain essentials, by strictly legal means of course —although in the existing temper of Baden any such modification was quite out of the question. He strongly recommended a political alliance between the court and the archbishop, saying that this would lead to the formation of a conservative party "with a specifically Catholic character." He failed to perceive that such a party would necessarily be hostile to the crown of Prussia.[1]

Blittersdorff's fall wrecked many of the secret hopes of the ultramontanes. But the government's embarrassments were still so obvious that the clericalists were able to venture another advance. Vicari, who had succeeded the pacific Demeter as archbishop, was a kind-hearted old man, weak and easily led, and it was not long before the enigmatic guests, lay and clerical, who assembled around his hospitable board in the Münsterplatz at Freiburg, were able to make their influence felt. Encouraged from Rome, and spurred on by

[1] Radowitz' Reports, May 26, July 18, and September 10, 1842; Radowitz Memorial concerning Baden, December 10, 1846.

numerous petitions from the Swabians inhabiting the shores of Lake Constance, in 1845 the archbishop suddenly decided that in Baden henceforward, as in Prussia, when mixed marriages were solemnised, it must be a condition that all the children were to be brought up as Catholics. Vicari had his will, despite the vigorous opposition of the government, and although some of the Catholic clergy would have preferred that the gentler old custom should remain in force. Thus was initiated an ecclesiastico-political struggle which was to endure for a quarter of a century.

The Roman see, since its unexpected victory in the Cologne dispute, had revived its ancient claims the world over. Even Würtemberg, hitherto envied for the serenity of its religious peace by all the parity states of Germany, was now to experience the first onslaught from the ultramontanes. In Würtemberg, the old state church system, which prevailed in all the states of the Upper Rhenish ecclesiastical province, was enforced with especial severity. The royal supreme supervisory authority, the Catholic ecclesiastical council, maintained all the rights of the state over the church with so much vigilance that King William's experience certainly justified him in advising the crown of Prussia to inaugurate a similar institution in that country. The ecclesiastical council did not even hesitate to intervene strenuously in the internal affairs of the church, issuing ordinances regarding divine service and prayers, specifying the length of sermons and homilies, and subjecting priestly ordinations to its approval. The territorial bishop, whose modest residence had been assigned to him in Rottenburg, manifestly in order to have him close to the strictly Protestant districts of Old Würtemberg and close to the parity university of the kingdom, had absolutely no disciplinary authority over his clergy, and had no benefices in his gift, for the crown, though upon dubious legal grounds, claimed all rights of patronage. Every decree issued by the diocesan court required the approval of the royal commissary. During these years, the king showed himself extremely suspicious of the Roman church. This sarcastic man of the world was by no means a zealous Protestant, but in these days of ferment he regarded a strong state authority as the only thing in which any trust could be placed, so that the clericalists of all shades seemed to him nothing better than frocked demagogues. He

plainly declared his wish to purge the Catholic faculty of Tübingen of the disciples of Möhler, and an ultramontane zealot named Mack was actually relieved of his professorship and sent to a quiet country parish.[1] Prussia's yielding policy in ecclesiastical matters filled the king's mind with grave concern, and he therefore gave a hearty welcome to the Gustavus Adolphus Union, promising it his patronage in an open despatch. In ecclesiastico-political disputes he more than once sought the advice of Wessenberg. This venerable old man belonged, in truth, to a past epoch. He continued to cherish the impossible dream of a German national church whose primacy was to be held in rotation by the archbishops of Cologne, Freiburg, and Munich. It was his especial desire that the placet should be maintained, and that no change should be made in the practices relating to mixed marriages—two demands which were impossible of fulfilment now that the crown of Prussia had given way.[2]

For many years Bishop Keller of Rottenburg, indifferent and senile, had cheerfully tolerated the tutelage of the state, a tutelage which was benevolent, though strict. He belonged to the easy-going old school, and in former years had been a member of the ecclesiastical council. By degrees, however, the new clericalist party began to pass beyond his control. Petitions poured in to Keller from the private tutors of the Catholic college at Tübingen university (the Wilhelmstift), the king's pet aversion;[3] from the Catholic nobles of Upper Swabia; and from the junior clerics, who in Tübingen as in Freiburg thronged the episcopal curia. Aspersions upon the bishop were current in Rome; the Vatican sent him threatening messages; and, in order to avoid the fate of Sedlnitzky, he at length decided to send to the diet of 1841-1842 a lengthy statement of the grievances of the Catholic church. The language of the accompanying memorial was so unrestrained that minister Schlayer assured Keller to his face that it must have been written by some youthful hothead.

The blow had been prepared long beforehand, for Count Zeil had talked the matter over in Munich with Abel and the

[1] Rochow's Reports, January 8, February 9 and 14, 1840.

[2] Wessenberg, Opinion concerning Catholic Ecclesiastical Conditions in Germany, May 21, 1840; A further Attempt at the Settlement of the Dispute anent the Solemnisation of Mixed Marriages, January, 1841.

[3] Rochow's Report, January 11, 1842.

nuncio.[1] But the opposing forces were already on the alert. The valiant Evangelicals in the town of Freudenstadt, which had been founded more than two centuries earlier by Protestant refugees, the pietist brethren of Calw and Kornthal, all the good Old Würtembergers, cried out in alarm that the Jesuits were about to storm the citadel of South German Protestantism. In the diet, after passionate debates, the bishop's grievances were all dismissed with a solitary exception, the complaint concerning press restrictions—though in truth a demand for the freedom of the press came strangely from Keller, who had in earlier days frequently referred to the godless licence of the newspapers. The incident showed where the real strength of the ultramontanes lay. If they were to make an adroit use of the magic word "freedom" in a protest against the undeniable severities of the old police state, they could rest assured of help from the liberals. Despite its victory, the government felt its position insecure, and endeavoured in a memorial to the Roman see to justify its position. Shortly afterwards (1844), Würtemberg voluntarily made two small concessions. The bishop was assigned somewhat enlarged disciplinary powers, and the patronage of fifteen parishes was placed at his disposal. The old-established territorialism had once again proved victorious, but its days were numbered.

§ 3. GERMAN CATHOLICISM.

The Roman church had not merely wrung extensive concessions from the state authorities; it had likewise maintained an effective resistance to attempts towards a sectarian movement which, though vain and foolish from the outset, nevertheless drew sustenance from the vague contemporary impulse towards political liberty. Arnoldi, the new bishop of Treves, rejected by the late king of Prussia, but favoured by that king's successor, soon fell into the hands of the clericalist party, and arranged in the summer of 1844 for the exposition of the holy coat of Treves, a spectacle which had been in abeyance for more than a generation, and whose resumption after this lapse of time could not but serve, as Görres publicly phrased it, to give a formal proof of triumph of the church over the parity state. This piece of priestly humbug was hazarded

[1] Dönhoff's Report, Munich, March 28, 1842.

although only a year earlier Pope Gregory had in a brief testified to the Benedictines of Argenteuil that the Saviour's holy coat was preserved in their altar. To crown all, two young Bonn professors, Gildemeister, the orientalist, and von Sybel, the historian, published a contentious, but serious and strictly scientific writing entitled *The Holy Coat of Treves and the Twenty other Seamless Holy Coats*, proving how much mischievous imposture had been carried on for many centuries with the aid of these falsified relics. But what does reasoned proof avail against pious illusion? What did it matter to Roman Catholic priests that Nitzsch, in a magnificent sermon preached at Bonn, exhorted the Protestants to pay honour, not to dead relics, but to the saving energy of the living Christ, expressing his compassion for the poor souls to whom the gospel had never been preached. Within seven weeks, eleven hundred thousand pilgrims made their way to Treves. In all the towns and villages of the beautiful Moselle valley the church bells were rung whenever a train of pilgrims passed through with streaming banners. In the episcopal town, the innkeepers, image vendors, and church furnishers reaped golden harvests. In the cathedral, the while, there echoed incessantly the fervent ejaculation, "Holy Coat, pray for us!" Nor were miracles lacking. A female relative of the sometime archbishop Droste-Vischering believed herself to have been cured of paralysis at the sight of the holy coat, and fun was made of the affair in a popular ballad. Serious-minded Protestants could not but be deeply concerned to note how the Roman clergy, blinded by fanaticism, were reviving all the evil practices to which the reformation had long ago put an end.

A shrill protest was suddenly voiced by a member of the priesthood. Johannes Ronge, a young priest of Laurahütte in Upper Silesia, who had recently been suspended from his chaplaincy at Grottkau for writing a freethinking newspaper article, now published in the *Sächsische Vaterlandsblätter*, a journal of radical complexion, an open letter to Arnoldi, attacking the bishop for his "idolatrous festival," and culminating in the words: "The historian has already seized his pen, Arnoldi, to hand down your name to the scorn of contemporaries and posterity, describing you as the Tetzel of the nineteenth century." The phrasing is enough to show that the vain writer, who obviously imagined himself to be a new Luther, was not carved out of the same wood as the reformers. He was

inspired with a commendable sentiment of youthful indignation at the display of Roman Catholic sanctimoniousness, but he knew nothing of the seriousness, the profundity, the self-renunciation, of the heroes of religion. His letter merely reiterated old truths to which Protestantism had long ere this given bolder and worthier expression. The only new things in it were the modern journalese style and the patriotic emotionalism of the composition. "Your fathers shattered the capital; do not heap contumely upon their names by tolerating a castle of St. Angelo in Germany." Such was his appeal to the bishop, and it was obvious that the writer's outlook was largely based upon Rotteck's *Universal History.*

Nevertheless, Ronge's writing aroused considerable, though transient, excitement. In wide circles the Treves spectacle was regarded as manifesting deliberate contempt for modern culture. The age conceived itself to be one in which thought was exceptionally free, and small as yet was the number of clear-headed persons who realised that in a century wherein so many remarkable contrasts prevailed a crude belief in authority must here and there continue to possess remarkable power, seeing that some swore no less blindly by the newspapers and the political catchwords of the day, than others swore by relics and images of the saints. In Silesia, since the fall of Sedlnitzky, the ultramontanes had displayed a challenging arrogance which irritated a populace already seething with dissatisfaction. Not infrequently the Breslau priests were made mock of in the streets; on one occasion no less a man than Prince-Bishop Diepenbrock was publicly insulted by some students. Once more became current those hazy ideas of reform which had never completely disappeared from the Catholic church in Silesia,[1] good-natured conceptions of a purified church, which was not to be Roman and yet was to remain Catholic. Within a few weeks Ronge had founded a congregation which formally announced its severance from Rome. It consisted mainly of persons belonging to the lower middle class, but was joined by two men of considerable scientific repute, Regenbrecht, professor of canon law, and the honest and erudite Father Anton Theiner, both of whom had long been detested by the clericalists for their bold campaign against celibacy and other Romish abuses. Meanwhile Father Czerski of Schneidemühl, a priest condemned on account of his secret

[1] See vol. IV, p. 202.

marriage, had left the Roman church with a considerable following, and within a brief time there came into existence in twenty-two North German towns dissenting communities which adopted the self-contradictory name of "German Catholics." The movement was much weaker in the south, for Austria and Bavaria persecuted the new sect with extreme rigour. The country folk, being devout Catholics, would have nothing to do with the dissenters. German Catholicism never numbered more than sixty thousand adherents, and fully half of these belonged to Ronge's Silesian home.

In the Vatican much alarm was felt at the outset, for who could foresee what would be the upshot of a schism upon this fervid soil, in the fatherland of the only heresy that had proved victorious? The clergy were instructed to act with worldly-wise moderation, and only the renegade priests were excommunicated. To Protestants, Ronge's undertaking was welcome. Many of them considered that the true essence of Protestantism was found in its antagonism to the papacy. Even those whose faith had deeper roots cherished the conviction that the Evangelical doctrine was the form of Christianity best suited to the German temperament, and they hoped therefore for the religious reunion of the nation. In almost every town in which a German Catholic congregation was formed, the Protestants hastened to place the town halls or the Protestant churches at the disposal of the schismatics.

In March, 1845, a council met in Leipzig to determine the creed and constitution of the new sect, and the religious weakness of the movement at once became manifest. German Catholicism did not merely suffer from a logical contradiction in that it aimed at being simultaneously universal and national Christianity, but was affected in addition with grave moral inveracity, for it professed to occupy a position midway between that of the Catholics and that of the Protestants, whereas in reality it had moved on far beyond the standing ground of the evangelical faith, and was akin to the most extreme among the Protestant sects. Thus at Königsberg, when the German Catholic services were inaugurated in that city, Jacoby, Falkson, and Korsch, leaders of the Jewish Liberals, participated by friendly invitation. At the Leipzig council, Ronge and his radical adherents carried off the victory. Dogmas were simplified in accordance with the broadest interpretations of rationalism, so that of their Christian content but little remained. The

congregations secured almost unlimited independence, many of them even giving votes to women members, though this was opposed to the custom of all the churches. Czerski, whose faith was of a somewhat more serious character, would not go these lengths, for he retained a belief in the divinity of Christ. Good Father Theiner, too, disgusted by Ronge's windy phrases, soon withdrew from the movement. It could already be foreseen that this inconsiderate adventure in sectarianism would inevitably perish in its conflict with the inexorable consistency of the Catholic church.

But at this epoch, dominated by a febrile passion for political liberty, people grasped at every straw, welcoming anything which was opposed to the old authorities in state and church. For the liberals of the day, Ulrich von Hutten was the favourite character in German history; his audacious frankness, his rhetorical emotionalism, his unfettered life, and his nebulous patriotic dreams, seemed to them typical of themselves. Just as Hutten had of old expected the reformation to lead to an uplifting of Germany in its power and its glory, so now did innumerable persons cherish similar vain aspirations. Ronge, the Silesian parish priest, was to be the pioneer of the imminent political revolution. Philosophical radicalism passed into the background for a season, now that religious freedom seemed all at once to offer definite prospects of practical advance. Many of the liberal newspapers extolled the leader of the German Catholics with an ardour that appeared positively ludicrous when contrasted with the man's futility and with the trifling measure of his achievements. In every shop-window hung the rhyme:

> Ronge, second Luther you,
> Bravely, bravely, strive and do!
> No more by vestment or by bell
> Shall priests contrive to fool us well.
> Superstition's knell is heard,
> Slain by Ronge's mighty word.

It was inevitable that a man so vainglorious should have his head turned by such praises. In a new circular to his coreligionists, to priests, and to teachers, he adopted the tone of the bombastic radical journalist. His boast ran that no more should the struggle with Romanism be waged in the gloomy recesses of the Teutoburg forest, for the contest was to be fought upon the mountain tops of the German spirit.

He prophesied that whereas in the first reformation Germany had forfeited world dominion, she would regain the hegemony through the reformation that was now at hand. He promised his associates that "the perdurable gratitude of history" would bear them onward through the ages.

Accompanied by his henchman Dowiat, an advanced radical and a fiery tub-thumper, Ronge now made the tour of South Germany, fêted everywhere, and receiving in his triumphal progress the universal acclamations of the opposition. Positively loathsome was the spectacle when the new Luther, seated in a four-in-hand beside Ruge and Froebel, freethinking demagogues, and beside Fickler, the darling of the liberals of southern Swabia, drove out of Constance to attend a church festival upon the neighbouring Swiss territory (where the demonstration could be held with impunity), and when the obese Fickler said with a smirk, "Never could I have dreamed that I should one day become an apostle!" At the banquet which followed the religious ceremony, Dowiat voiced a thunderous pereat against the St. Petersburg of the south and the St. Petersburg of the north, whilst a few guileless men of Constance announced their adhesion to the new congregation. Dowiat had their names duly inscribed in his church register, and, after a solemn address, returned with a sarcastic smile to his champagne. It was natural that the pious Wessenberg, despite his own grievances against Rome, should expressly dissociate himself from these frivolous proceedings. But many other men of standing overestimated the importance of the movement. There was a fresh ebullition of the ancient hatred of the Protestants for the Roman antichrist, since all were struggling to emerge from the stifling atmosphere of these days of expectation. Despite his perspicacity, even Carl Mathy was, for a brief period, deceived as to the significance of the doings of these religious demagogues. It must be remembered that his own father had been a Catholic priest, who through severe mental struggles had at length won his way to Protestant freedom.

It need hardly be said that the irrepressible old Paulus wrote *A Justification of the German Catholics.* He honestly believed that they would carry into effect the peace of Westphalia, would reconcile the conflicting creeds of Germany. Röhr, the Weimar rationalist, hailed the new attack upon Rome with equal confidence. Even Gervinus, the most secular

minded among the younger historians, was impelled to foretell a great future for *The Mission of the German Catholics*; whilst in a second polemic writing he took the Protestant pastors roundly to task for their attitude of reserve. He believed it to be in accordance with natural law that to the religious epoch and the literary epoch in Germany there should now succeed a political epoch. Filled with this hope, he acclaimed the new sect as the germ of a great national religious union which, transcending dogma, was to live solely for morality, tolerance, and defence against alien influences. Of the saving energy of the divine promise, of the integrating impulse of the living faith, he had no inkling whatever. But he gave the first sketch of a new democratic philosophy of history which was destined to work much disaster in the heads of those who are only half able to think. Whereas historical progress had hitherto invariably been due to the interaction between great personalities, and the general environing conditions had been brought about by men who realised how a new world was to be upbuilded upon the ruins of the old, in the nineteenth century a sudden change in the character of history was supposed to have occurred, so that the developmental movement would henceforward be independent of the power of genius, and would be conditioned solely by the opinions and the passions of the masses. Such was the tenour of the latest historical revelation, when Otto von Bismarck had just attained the age of thirty years. Gervinus did not shrink from the conclusion that the German Catholics could face the future with confidence precisely because they numbered among their adherents not a single man of weight. He stubbornly adhered to this conception, although it is above all in religious history that the power of individuality has been so amazingly conspicuous, for at no time and in no place has a powerful religion or sect come into being without the awakening energy of God-inspired apostles and prophets.

This arid political appraisement of religious matters was so ungerman as to horrify even Gervinus' closest friends. Especially distasteful was it to Dahlmann. From early days, Dahlmann, far more thoughtful, and therefore more modest, than his younger associate Gervinus, had been a man of strongly religious feelings, and regretted as much as Niebuhr had regretted that his whole cultural development had estranged him from religious life. With humility he declared: "No church can

be founded upon mere moral teaching. I am confident that those who lean on the personality of Christ are the mainspring of the church. When we others go in and out, we make a draught, but let in no warmth." Thudichum, the liberal theologian of Büdingen, writing adversely of the German Catholics, quietly enquired: "Where is to be found the constructive energy of the new sect, seeing that, despite the clamour of the newspapers, the Roman church and the Evangelical church still stand firm?" Ullmann of Heidelberg, leader of the mediation school of theology, a thoughtful and refined man with artistic endowments, gave utterance to similar views. In his *Reflections concerning the German Catholic Movement* he enquired: "How can a permanent religious community come into existence unless it spring, as it were from a single seed, out of the elemental and full life of an outstanding and intellectually vigorous personality?"

The doubters were right. A year later, German Catholicism had been completely secularised, had been overwhelmed in the turmoil of radical politics. By the irony of fate it was to leave a permanent trace in the kingdom of Saxony alone, in the only one of the larger German states which contained hardly any Catholics, and which therefore offered a peculiarly unfavourable soil for a serious movement on behalf of Catholic reform. The happy opening phase of constitutional life in Saxony was drawing to a close. Minister Lindenau, creator of the fundamental law, felt that his position was becoming insecure. He was much in disfavour at Vienna, for he had not concealed his opinion that the decisions of the ministerial conferences of 1834 were objectionable. In the German, the French, and the English press he was repeatedly acclaimed as the adversary of Metternich, and found it necessary on one occasion to enter into very disagreeable diplomatic explanations with the two German great powers on account of certain ultra-liberal utterances falsely attributed to him by the press.[1] At court he had never been forgiven for advising the king to exchange the income from the royal domains for a civil list, seeing that by the rigid Hallerians this course was held to involve a degradation of the monarchy.[2] The

[1] Minister von Minckwitz, Verbal Note for the envoys in Berlin and Vienna, December 9, 1834.

[2] Jordan's Report, August 25, 1843.

upper house was hostile to the minister. The territorial nobles refused to accede to the abolition of patrimonial courts, and they were equally adverse to the payment of a reasonable compensation for damage caused by game, although a law to enforce this compensation was absolutely essential to agriculture in the densely populated rural districts. Radicalism, on the other hand, which in Saxony had been at work beneath the surface,[1] was manifestly on the increase, the change being first conspicuous in Vogtland. New deputies were elected to the chamber, first of all the Vogtlanders, Todt, Dieskau, and Watzdorf, well-meaning liberals, who were however carried away by the prevailing current, and soon went so far as to demand a unicameral system. Being thus placed between two fires, Lindenau, whose disposition was that of a gentle scholar, found the situation impossible, and in 1843 he resigned, to the great regret of the more thoughtful among his fellow countrymen.

Von Könneritz, minister for justice, an able jurist of rigidly conservative views, now became ministerial chief. The new government was not positively reactionary, but was hostile to liberalism, for a new wind was now blowing from Berlin; and in the counsels of the government there speedily became evident that perplexity which is a common herald of revolutionary movements. The authorities were alternately weak and severe. Poverty was widespread; several towns were devastated by great conflagrations. The general discontent was accentuated by the drought of the year 1842, by the potato disease, and by a crisis in many of the great industries of the Erzgebirge. In the diet, Minister Könneritz put up a stout and eloquent defence of the utterly lost cause of the old method of criminal procedure, which was secret and was conducted by written testimony. He stood almost alone. The liberals collected funds to enable Braun, one of the leading lawyers in their party, to visit the countries where legal hearings were public, and to gather information regarding trial by jury. Thus suddenly did a political sense awaken in this country which had hitherto been so tranquil. In the new elections, meanwhile, the opposition had gained strength. Schaffrath, Joseph, and several other radicals, found their way to the diet, but they were still few in number, inspired with measureless designs, but lacking definiteness when it came to action.

[1] See vol. V, p. 183.

Mutterings were heard even in the mining centre of Freiberg, which had hitherto invariably been loyal, when quarrels broke out between the mining students and the garrison, (quarrels which might easily have been prevented by a little opportune severity on the part of the authorities),[1] and when the government, after a disastrous duel, rusticated fully two-thirds of the students. For a time, the complete loss of the celebrated mining academy, the country's pride, seemed imminent.

Once more, now, as has ever happened in modern Saxon history during uneasy times, was to be manifest the old curse of the Albertine house; innocent posterity had to suffer for the unlucky change of faith of Augustus the Strong. King Antony's intentions were excellent; he was quite free from religious narrow-mindedness; and the Vatican was too familiar with the rigidly Protestant sentiments of Electoral Saxony to choose this region for a fresh turn of the screw. Nevertheless the populace was profoundly disquieted by the arrogance which the ultramontane party displayed in the adjoining lands of Prussia and Bavaria; the Saxons universally believed that in their country, too, the clericalists were at work; and the cry soon became current, "The Jesuits are here!" There was no serious ground for complaint. The Archconfraternity of the Sacred Heart had founded a small community in Lusatia, but this had been done without the knowledge of the government; further, in the new Catholic church at Annaberg, the name of St. Ignatius was found to have been inscribed upon the high altar, and the quite arbitrary inference was drawn that the church therefore belonged to the Society of Jesus. This was practically all. But the suspicions of the people could not be allayed, and with incredible blindness these suspicions were especially directed against Prince John who, though indubitably a stricter Catholic than his royal brother, had invariably displayed an unimpeachable moderation in all ecclesiastico-political questions, and through whose instrumentality the Protestant soldiers had just been relieved of the obligation to practise genuflexion in the Hofkirche at Dresden. The much maligned prince was supposed to be a thorough Jesuit. The belief spread even to the school children. When, during the breaking up of the ice in the spring of 1845, the great golden crucifix was carried away from the Dresden bridge, and was for ever lost in the waters of the river, the incident was universally regarded as a sign of God's wrath.

[1] Jordan's Report, February 19, 1845.

It was simply owing to this morbid dread of the Jesuits and to the prevalence of political discontent that among the handful of Saxon Catholics there came into existence several German Catholic congregations, which, reinforced by radical Protestants, entered into an alliance with the free congregations of the neighbouring Prussian province. The leader of the movement in Dresden was Wigard, the shorthand writer, a vulgar chatterer. The leader in Leipzig was Robert Blum, next to Friedrich List the most brilliant demagogue of the day. Born in Cologne, of poor parents, Blum had in youth been an acolyte in the parish church attended by his parents. Subsequently, by his own exertions, he raised himself out of poverty, and secured a tolerable education; but as he never got beyond the outlook of the lesser bourgeoisie, he retained throughout life the complete sympathy of the common people. He possessed in full measure the natural eloquence of the Rhinelander, combining therewith an uncanny talent for influencing his fellows. When this broad-shouldered, cheerful burgher, far from handsome, but clever and good-natured of aspect, and noteworthy for his piercing brown eyes, rose to speak, and when with his deep tone he delivered himself in impassioned phrases, sentimental when it served his turn, it was natural that the manual workers and the shop assistants should feel: "Blum is the man for us." At this date in Leipzig he occupied the modest position of secretary and cashier to the Leipzig theatre, but was none the less already a power in the world. At the annual Schiller festivals, of which he had been the founder, he paid homage to the singer of liberty. He carried on an active correspondence with the leaders of the South German opposition parties; the Polish refugees sought asylum in his house; in the dead of night he made the key which was to open the gate of Cracow citadel to the rebels. In all the elections he displayed an indefatigable activity which he himself frankly described as "agitation." With the pen of a ready writer he formulated his democratic principles in the political almanac *Vorwärts* and in the *Sächsische Vaterlandsblätter*, an influential journal, which loved to make fun of the little Gothamites of particularism. Here in Central Germany there could be no lack of matter for such criticism. Blum had merely to look towards Altenburg, with its proud and spendthrift court; or towards Reuss of the younger line, where the ruler was the half insane Prince Henry LXXII.

The mere reprint of this benevolent patriarch's decrees was enough to rejoice the radicals. His garden in Osterstein was thrown open to all respectable strangers, but "at nightfall visitors must leave. Why? Because after dark it is no longer possible to distinguish between the respectable and the non-respectable." After a fire in Lobenstein the two-and-seventieth Henry gave vent to the following: "*My* principle is, first put the fire out, and then pack off. For, you see, if a little fire be quickly extinguished, the people can go to sleep better than if through neglect a badly built town perchance goes up in flames."

Never weary of diffusing democratic ideas, it seemed to Blum to have been a piece of peculiar good fortune that he should have been baptised as a Catholic, and he hastened to get control of the German Catholics in Leipzig. He frankly admitted to his intimates that this religious imbroglio was a mere means to his political ends. He made inflammatory speeches at the Leipzig council, standing behind a table covered with a cloth. When any difficult canonical question arose, Wuttke, the historian, a venemous little radical salamander, sitting close at hand behind a pile of books, would pass Blum a note under cover of the tablecloth. A glance was enough to enable the founder of a new church to deliver himself with marvellous fluency concerning such matters as the council of Trent, of which before this he had perchance hardly known a word.

The government had meanwhile had its fears aroused, for the free congregations of Prussia had sent emissaries to Saxony and had fraternised with the German Catholics. On June 17, 1845, the ministers whose duty it was to maintain the Lutheran ecclesiastical regime declared that the terms of their official oath made it impossible for them to tolerate meetings or associations by which the Augsburg confession was questioned. The aim of this announcement was plainly malicious, and the step was extremely ill-advised, as was almost everything undertaken by Könneritz and by Falkenstein, the new minister for home affairs. Literally interpreted, the decree in fact restricted freedom of conscience, for it implied a prohibition upon leaving the Lutheran church. But in any case it showed quite clearly that the Saxon government, like the Prussian, designed to break with the old rationalism. Now the spirit of the enlightenment, easy-going and tolerant to the pitch

of indifference, was still universally dominant among the people, above all in the towns. The honoured representative of these views, Ammon, an old man, was still first chaplain in ordinary to the court. The ministerial decree consequently aroused general discontent, and once more all the blame was visited upon Prince John, who had had nothing to do with the matter.

Feeling ran high, and the authorities had received several warnings, when on August 12th the prince came to Leipzig to inspect the communal guard. While the review was in progress, the onlookers permitted themselves a number of impudent freedoms, and when subsequently, late in the evening, in the summer-house of the Prussian Arms in the Rossplatz, the prince sat at table with the official chiefs, a furious crowd assembled in the wide square. The people sang *God is to us a Tower of Strength*; then came cheers for Ronge and Czerski, savage songs, curses, and invectives; finally a hail of stones was thrown at the windows of the inn. Not one of the authorities was sufficiently courageous to face the crowd and say a few vigorous words. Not until the disorder became more and more threatening was a message sent to the guard-room of the communal guard. Immediately afterwards, Colonel von Buttlar, commanding officer in the town, an extremely capable soldier, complying with a request from the civil authorities, sent for a battalion of his troops. The black musketeers, still in extremely bad odour with the mob as a sequel of the street fighting in Dresden, arrived on the scene before the easy-going militiamen. To show his confidence, the prince came out for a moment and ordered that the square should be cleared, returning to his guests in the summer-house without in the least foreseeing what was about to happen.[1] Meanwhile the musketeers had without violence cleared the greater part of the square, and the crowd now thronged the avenues which border the Rossplatz. More stones were thrown; there was more hooting and defiance. Repeated orders to disperse were unheard or unheeded. At length two platoons of musketeers fired into the densely packed multitude, seven persons were killed on the spot, and a good many were wounded. The firing was an unfortunate issue of undue haste, not

[1] Thus ran the prince's own report (Falkenstein, King John of Saxony, p. 160). It need hardly be said that his record is trustworthy in all essential points, but it was unmistakably compiled considerably after the events referred to, and therefore contains a few and easily explicable inaccuracies.

deliberately planned, but not excusable on the ground of urgent necessity. It would seem that two of the officers, in the twilight and amid the wild confusion, had lost their heads, and had overestimated the danger. When the whole communal guard was at length turned out, the crowd dispersed, but a feeling of intense anger remained in the hearts of the burghers. Prince John, surprised and much distressed at the fatal issue, was once again considered responsible for all that had happened, and when he drove away early next morning his carriage was followed with maledictions and with volleys of stones.

By all parties alike the importance of this tragical incident was overestimated, for the whole world was alert with the feeling that a great decision was at hand. Freiligrath wrote his sonorous ode upon Leipzig's dead:

> I am the night of Saint Bartholomew,
> My feet are bloody and my face is veiled.
> A sovereign power within this German land
> Has this year kept my feast twelve days too soon.

Fine verses, these, and yet when confronted with the sober reality they have an almost ludicrous ring. No less exaggerated was the view taken in Vienna of this outbreak of the mob, from which the excellent burghers of the fair-town had held completely aloof. To Metternich it seemed that the revolution whose coming he had been dreading for an entire generation was approaching with giant stride. In the previous April he had written to the members of the Austrian diplomatic service: "If the evil should at length emerge into the open from the ambush in which it now lurks, the governments will feel obliged to take action, but they will be faced with insurgents whom in the long run the regular forces will find it difficult to withstand."[1] A report entirely in the spirit of the master was now sent in by Hübner, Austrian consul general in Leipzig, an able and ambitious reactionary, who was in high favour with the Society of Jesus. This "so-called intellectual capital," pampered by the weakness of the authorities, was, he said, next to Königsberg, the capital of German demagogy. The men of letters had been the real authors of the riot, and had used the students as their tools. "Everything here is ripe for revolution, and no one is prepared to accept conciliation."

[1] Metternich's Memorial, April 30, 1845.

The description was so grossly overdrawn that even the Prussian ministry felt it expedient to suggest that the Austrian was not free from prejudice.[1]

On the morrow of the bloody affray the royal authorities were paralysed with fear; not a soldier was to be seen in the streets. The students, who during the night had broken into the fencing-school, were, in collaboration with the communal guard, exclusively responsible for the maintenance of public order. In the afternoon crowds of burghers and students thronged the shooting-gallery, where everyone heaped curses on the prince, who was falsely assumed to have deliberately planned the affair, and where all demanded vengeance for the blood that had been spilled. At this juncture, Robert Blum suddenly appeared in the meeting, now intensely excited. The previous day he had been absent from Leipzig, a fact which proved greatly to his advantage; and he had come direct from the station to the shooting-gallery. Grasping the situation in a moment, he realised that the time for further deeds of violence had not yet arrived. In a vigorous and deeply impressive speech he assured his hearers that expiation was due to the town, but must be secured by legal means. Thereupon, he led the angry audience, numbering thousands, in good order to the market place. No excesses, so Blum boasted, "stained the genuine majesty of this popular assembly." After a brief interval he announced from the balcony of the town hall that the town council had complied with the wishes of the people, would demand the withdrawal of the garrison, and would insist upon the king's ordering a strict enquiry. For four days Blum ruled the town as dictator, the authorities seeming non-existent. At the funeral of the slain there were further fierce speeches, but absolutely no disorder occurred. The communal guard, acting on the demagogue's instructions, kept strict watch.

For a time the Dresden court was at its wits' end. The ministers did not pluck up courage until through Blum's resoluteness the immediate danger had been averted, but then at length they took effective measures. In the dead of night, infantry and artillery were despatched to Leipzig, and under the protection of these armed forces, a royal commissary put in an appearance on August 17th, Privy Councillor von

[1] Hübner's Report to Metternich, August 27; Despatch to Canitz from the Prussian minister for home affairs, October 11, 1845.

Langen, a learned jurist, who in all political disputes had shown himself to be an ultra-reactionary. On this occasion he lived up to his partisan reputation. He announced, as was meet, that there would be a strict enquiry directed against those who had incited the trouble; but he added that the government would uphold the actions of its instruments—though these had by no means been above reproach. The town, he said bluntly, has an offence to expiate, and is not in a position to demand expiation. In the diet, subsequently, Minister Falkenstein used yet more arrogant language towards the Leipzigers, saying that they must repent and must admit the error of their ways. Publication of the results of the commissary's preliminary investigation took place six weeks after the event, and the report contained manifest untruths. Not content with declaring what was incontestably the fact, that Prince John had not given orders to fire, the report actually denied that he had ever come out into the square before the shooting took place, although this statement was utterly irrelevant, and although the prince frankly admitted that he had done what was denied. It was inevitable that these servile inaccuracies should arouse suspicion that the government was dealing out false measure. At the subsequent legal proceedings very little of a definite character came to light. The radical agents, who had doubtless been secretly at work, turning to their own ends the masses' blind hatred of papistry, succeeded in covering up their tracks. The officers immediately responsible were quietly withdrawn from Leipzig.

Bureaucratic timidity thus left a cloud of obscurity, although there was in truth nothing terrible to hide. But petty malice was abundantly displayed by the authorities. A number of writers of alien nationality were expelled from Saxony, and even Wilhelm Jordan, born in East Prussia and a graduate of Königsberg, but a Saxon subject, was similarly treated. The court of Dresden besieged Berlin with demands that severe measures be taken against the radicals in the province of Saxony, who were alleged to have been accomplices. Complaints were especially directed against the students of Halle university, although an apparitor who was promptly sent to Leipzig could not discover a single Halle student in that city. The press, above all, was a source of great anxiety to the Saxon court.

[1] Minister von Zeschau to von Bose, chargé d'affaires in Berlin, August 14 and 17; Curator Pernice of Halle to Eichhorn, August 16 and 20, 1845.

The *Kölnische Zeitung*, the *Schlesische Zeitung*, and the *Magdeburgische Zeitung*, hastened to furnish their readers with highly tinted reports of the Leipzig massacre, grossly distorting many of the facts. Minckwitz, Saxon envoy in Berlin, brought the Prussian ministers whole sheaves of newspaper articles, and importuned the Prussian government to forbid any reference to the Leipzig incidents, or at least to ascertain the names of the wicked correspondents. By the new censorship regulations, though these did not err on the side of lenity, the suggested steps were inadmissible. Moreover, it soon became apparent to Berlin that the Saxon ministers were seeking vengeance upon certain suspect writers in Leipzig. This pitiful clamour endured for four months, but in the end nothing was done.[1]

Such was the state of affairs at the opening of the new Saxon diet, which was noisy and turbulent. The opposition at once raised bitter complaints, its radical wing already going so far as to demand, following the terms of a petition sent in by Robert Blum, that the strength of the army should be reduced and that the soldiers should have to swear fealty to the constitution. For the moment the opposition could make no headway, but the court felt that its opponents' confidence was steadily increasing, and a suggestion was made to the neighbouring courts that nothing could save the situation unless all the crowns were to enter into a stable union. Metternich's reply was to promise the moral support of Austria. Jordan, the veteran Prussian envoy, who was in general inclined to look upon the Almighty as a good fellow, passed an anxious comment upon Metternich's pledge, writing: "I fear the time may be at hand when 'appui moral' will no longer suffice."[2]

Since the stormy days of August, Robert Blum had in truth come to wield dangerous influence. Hübner made a prophecy which was destined to be fulfilled when he said: "Blum maintains order, and he will exact grievous payment for this service." The government could find nothing against Blum, and was indeed in the clever demagogue's debt. He was adored by the populace, and at every banquet, at every political assembly, his presence was indispensable. His friends were universally at work fanning the flames of discontent,

[1] Verbal Notes to Canitz: from Bose, August 20 and 26; from Minckwitz, September 10 and 27, 1845, etc.; Canitz to Bodelschwingh, October 20 and December 14, 1845.

[2] Jordan's Report, November 3, 1845.

and it was mainly owing to his influence that upon the outbreak of the revolution Saxony shared with Baden the reputation of being more radical than any other German state. The ministers knew so little of their own country that they overlooked the fact that Blum had more adherents in the lesser industrial towns than in Leipzig itself. It is true that in Leipzig he had numerous supporters, whose interest was kept alive by the Schiller festivals and by the debating club which Blum had just founded. But the core of the well-to-do and cultured bourgeoisie held moderate liberal views, and when the days of trial came no other town in the land was more tranquil and more law-abiding than Leipzig, which had been so despitefully used by the government.

The upshot was that the German Catholic movement remained utterly sterile as far as religious life was concerned, its only effect being to make the Roman church appear more unassailable than ever. In the diets there were, of course, lively debates concerning toleration of the new sect. The more liberal a government, the more friendly was its demeanour towards Ronge's adherents, the court of Brunswick being pre-eminently conspicuous in this respect. In the Badenese diet, Pastor Zittel demanded absolute religious freedom and equality before the law for all the Christian sects. A typical son of a Badenese parsonage, a man of wide culture, gentle, devout, fully inspired with the philanthropic wisdom of Hebel, Zittel would gladly have demanded full civil rights for the Jews, and his only reason for refraining from this step was his recognition of the profound detestation felt by the peasants for "the landgrabbers" and "the horse-dealers." But he was unable to carry through even his modest proposals, for the ultra-montanes of the highlands raised the alarm, and the government became anxious.

The attitude of the Prussian crown towards the new sect was most vacillating. The king's first impulse was to hail Ronge's secession with delight. In his view, both the churches would gain internal energy through sloughing their unbelievers. In the same spirit, General Thile advised that Czerski's little congregation at Schneidemühl, which had been expelled from the Roman church, should receive as favourable treatment as possible. "Presumably this will encourage the Evangelical sectaries, too, to secede from the territorial church, and this will perhaps open the way to a purification of our church."

Since the Schneidemühlers were well behaved folk, Frederick William was even inclined to admit the kinship of their views with the doctrines of the Augsburg confession, and to express his approval of their action.[1] But after a conversation with Archbishop Geissel at Stolzenfels, the king's suspicions were awakened. He became aware that political radicalism was spreading in the sect. When he learned that Ronge had visited the Evangelical church at Jerschendorf, to advise the congregation to secede, he wrote in anger: "To-day as yet we hear nothing of serious enquiry, and still less do we hear of any punishment for the offence!!!!!!! It is my serious will that in future our church shall receive the same legal protection against neocatholic onslaughts, that the Roman church enjoys among us."[2] After much discussion, he ultimately resolved that the legal position of the German Catholics and that of the Protestant dissenters should be simultaneously regulated in a comprehensive edict of toleration.

§ 4. OLD LUTHERANS AND FREE CONGREGATIONS.

There was an obvious justification for the design, seeing that the Evangelical church was likewise torn by sectarian movements. The longest established and most respectable of these Protestant sects was that of the Old Lutherans. From the first, Frederick William had done his utmost to secure just and considerate treatment for the members of this body, and before he came to the throne he had invariably condemned the use of harsh measures against them.[3] As king, he tacitly permitted them to conduct their services without interference, and allowed the emigrant preachers to return home. It was years, however, before he ventured upon the legal recognition of the sect, for the prince of Prussia urgently and stubbornly withstood the proposal. The heir presumptive, inspired with a profound veneration for his father's memory, insisted that the formal revocation of the late government's ordinances would be unseemly, and that all that was expedient was to instruct the authorities to tolerate the Old Lutherans. In

[1] Thile's Memorial concerning Schneidemühl, January 11; Thile to Uhden and Eichhorn and Report to the king, September 6, 1845.

[2] King Frederick William to Thile, July 4, 1846.

[3] See vol. VI pp. 85 et seq,

this, as in other respects, the contrast between the two brothers was noteworthy. The faithful Thile was already afraid lest Prince William should, by the force of his character, acquire dominance over the ministerial council. "The prince," he wrote warningly, "possesses in high degree the gifts of tenacity and energy in the pursuit of his aims. The experience that a policy of persistent opposition will enable him to attain his ends, cannot but serve to confirm these tendencies." [1]

Prince William secured this much at least, that on July 23, 1845, instead of a law, no more was promulgated than a "general concession." All civil rights were secured for the Old Lutherans; they were permitted to form church congregations under a joint governing body; christenings and marriages became legally valid as soon as they had been reported to the courts; but the Old Lutheran meeting houses were not to be known by the name of "churches." How contradictory did it seem that a church even older than the united territorial church should at this late date secure no more than conditional recognition. But a long-standing injustice had at length been removed. Fifty thousand in number, the old Lutherans constituted henceforward a religious community with Breslau as their centre; of devout and pious inclinations, they showed themselves in addition to be extremely narrow-minded; and whilst they did not positively forbid "mixed marriages" between Lutherans and members of the united Evangelical church, they none the less stigmatised such marriages as dangerous to salvation. For these petrified zealots all that Thomasius had written upon the marriage question a century and a half earlier, and all the historic progress that had been effected since those days, were practically non-existent. Nor was it long before the separatist Lutheran spirit made its appearance even within the fold of the united church. Superintendent Otto, and other strict Lutheran pastors in the regions adjoining the mouths of the Oder, attempted to form within the union a circumscribed Old Pomeranian territorial church.

Far more dangerous, in the king's view, were the radical Protestants, whose voices now became audible in the province of Saxony, the old home of the enlightenment. In this region religious discord had begun during the last days of the Altenstein ministry. Bishop Dräseke, the mighty pulpit orator, and a preacher named Sintenis, who had solemnly condemned

[1] Thile's Report to the king, March 17, 1845.

praying to Christ, harangued one another from their respective pulpits. The orthodox of Berlin, although the bishop was by no means a member of their party, espoused his cause like one man. In the province, on the other hand, at least among the elder clergy and among the lower middle classes, the views of the Halle rationalists Wegscheider and Gesenius were still dominant, and the bishop, who but a short while before had stood high in popular esteem, was unsparingly attacked in newspapers and in pamphlets. Eichhorn endeavoured to restore peace by imposing silence upon both antagonists. The proud prelate could not stomach this humiliation. Feeling that he had lost control over his flock, he resigned office, and withdrew to Potsdam a broken man; and there in his retirement not even the king's favour sufficed to console him after his signal overthrow. This incident greatly increased the self-opiniatedness of the rationalists; and just as in earlier years Altenstein's harsh endeavours to promote the union of the churches had stimulated the sectarian spirit of the Old Lutherans, so now was radicalism inflamed by Eichhorn's religious strictness, and no less so by that of Göschel, the new president of the Magdeburg consistory. From 1841 onwards a considerable number of rationalistic pastors assembled at regular intervals to discuss the reform of the church in the spirit of a simplified and rationalised evangelical Christianity. Terming themselves "the Protestant friends," they were named by their adversaries "the enlightened friends." They were speedily joined by a number of laymen, and their strength increased mightily year by year. The railways now exhibited for the first time their democratic power. The new lines linking up the Saale, the Elbe, and the Mulde, carried thousands of these reformers. In the great station at Coethen were held several large public meetings of the enlightened friends, who discussed the future of Christianity over their beer and tobacco.

The leaders of this movement, being thoroughly upright and earnestly religious, were in these respects advantageously distinguished from the windbags of German Catholicism. Leberecht Uhlich, when a country parson in Coethen, had frankly displayed his Protestant sentiments vis-à-vis the Catholic court. Subsequently, as pastor in a village near Magdeburg, he had discharged his duties with so much zeal that for a time he was actually decried as a pietist, seeing that most of the other rationalists troubled themselves little concerning the care of

souls. When he secured a pulpit in the town of Magdeburg, the less wealthy burghers flocked to hear him preach. They had faith in him because he spoke their vernacular, lived among them, and had his sons trained as simple handicraftsmen. In a noisy public meeting, the tumult was instantly stilled when this ungainly man raised his powerful voice. The excellent rationalist never doubted that his own feet were still firmly planted upon the soil of his beloved Evangelical church. He continued to preach in accordance with the principles which he had imbibed from Wegscheider at the university, and could not conceive why this should now be made an occasion for reproach. Fundamentally honest, likewise, was Pastor Wislicenus of Halle, a man of keen intelligence, who had paid somewhat closer attention than had Uhlich to the disputes of modern theology, and had consequently been led to adopt some of the ideas of the young Hegelians.

These two leaders were followed by a great number of simple and pious souls to whom it was a continual distress that the conflict between Christian revelation and the current doctrines of natural and historical science, could no longer be ignored. Deeply rooted among the masses was the old and easy-going rationalism, by whose principles, as by those of the well-known "pleasant" catechism of the Holsteiners, the moral duty of mankind was comprised in the leading of an agreeable and respectable life. Bogumil Goltz, the pious West Prussian poet, positively shuddered when he contemplated this generation of persons entirely content with mundane life and utterly estranged from all thoughts of holy things, and he launched his warnings in a spirited but formless work, *Germany's Degeneration as witnessed in the Enlightened Life of Modern Times.* Malcontents in general were grouped behind the rationalists. In one way or another discontent with the arrest of public life had to find vent. In the regions of Lutheran tradition, dissatisfaction secured expression first of all in religious questions. The land of ancient civilisation and vigorous intellectual activity was slower than any other Prussian province to interest itself in the struggles of political life. But when political passion was at length aroused, religious partisanship vanished as quickly as it had appeared, for its source had lain in a vague uneasiness rather than in a stirring of conscience. Simultaneously the religious dispute flamed up in Königsberg. Rupp, the army chaplain, preaching to his

soldiers, attacked the Athanasian Creed. This proceeding was hailed by Jacoby's Jewish circle with a torrent of malicious praise; but at the instigation of General Dohna, the preacher was called to account by the consistory. Rupp was a most worthy man, a Christian to the bottom of his soul, and was of higher culture than the two Saxons, but the inexorable impulse towards truth which is part of the very essence of Protestantism had led him to confuse the professorial chair with the pulpit, and thus to offer his flock the stone of theological criticism instead of the bread of the gospel.

The fight waxed yet more furious when in 1844, at a meeting in Coethen, Wislicenus mooted the question, "The letter or the spirit?" This he answered in plain terms with the words: "Our doctrine is not of the letter." Thereupon the orthodox of Halle were roused to battle, for in the theological faculty of that centre, rationalism, weakened from age, had almost entirely lost its hold. First among the adversaries came Guericke, who had been prosecuted some years before, but had lately been reinstated. A strict Lutheran, afraid of no man, almost a radical in politics, he had so consistent a belief in miracle that even Balaam's ass gave him no difficulties. Next came Tholuck, preaching sermons for the times, directed against unbelief. These were outspoken and eloquent, issuing from a devout and well-stored mind, but were harsh and unjust in their estimate of the philosophy of the Frederician age. In the interim Hengstenberg's *Kirchenzeitung* had begun to sound the alarm. Hundreds of pastors, led by Büchsel, declared in its columns that they felt it necessary to renounce pastoral community with Wislicenus, the unbeliever. In this marvellously transformed epoch, the solemn ban of the church now manifested itself in the frivolous form of newspaper articles. Counter-declarations were not lacking, bearing many more signatures, but these signatures were for the most part those of laymen. Moreover, many outspoken enemies of Christianity participated in the fray, hoping to deal another shrewd blow against the church.

In former days, under the gentle governance of its territorial sovereigns, Germany's Evangelical church had almost invariably been able to repress such sectarian movements. It was the glory of that church that, unlike the pharisaical state church of England, it had not dealt with the radical elements inevitable to Protestantism by expelling them as

dissenters, but had as a rule patiently tolerated them, and had thereby again and again appeased them. No time could have been more unfavourable than the present for a breach with these fine traditions. For a century, rationalism had dominated the pulpits. Its historic right was incontestable. Now that it had passed into a state of senile decay, its representatives, poor in intelligence and in faith, could no longer be dangerous to the church. The German conscience was struggling to reconcile the modern scientific outlook on the world with the eternal truth of Christianity. Even the pious Twesten sadly admitted to his friend Perthes, a man of like ideas, "We believers have, in truth, more longing for belief, than actual belief." In days of doubt and ferment, in an epoch that was unmistakably secular, the church should have scrupulously avoided any rash intervention, and should have allowed ideas to ripen and the formation of parties to take place in perfect freedom.

King Frederick William held other views. His adversaries were unjust in the reproach that he was led astray by the example of the Anglican church, for he was well acquainted with the weaknesses of that body. It was from his own most intimate emotional experiences, from the whole nature of his being and his thought, that he derived the conviction that the living church must be composed solely of genuine believers—a lofty ideal, but one utterly unrealisable amid the infirmities of this world. As long as the extant church constitution remained in force, he desired, as the trusty Thile phrased it, to remain, if not the "centrum auctoritatis" at least the "centrum unitatis" for the Protestant territorial church. As he frequently declared to Eichhorn, the duty which thus devolved upon him as head of the church seemed to him infinitely more important than his responsibilities for the foreign policy of his state. He believed himself to be acting in accordance with the spirit of evangelical freedom and to be doing a loving Christian service to his erring brothers when, in order to save them from hypocrisy, he threw wide the portal of exit from the church. His only trouble was the reflection that undue facilities for this exit might perchance magnify the temptation to secession. For this reason, Eichhorn explained at the very outset to the enlightened friends in Magdeburg that they had but two alternatives, to leave the church, or to abandon their plans for religious reform. In a lengthy

memorial, which secured the king's entire approval, Thile explained that the Augsburg confession was the sole legal foundation for the existence of the Protestant church. Were as many as half the members to secede, those who formed the remaining half would cohere all the more strongly, as was proved by what had happened in the case of the Old Lutherans. "It is not," he wrote in conclusion, "that we wish to decide who is and who is not Evangelical; we merely wish to open the door for the departure of those who have recognised that they no longer belong to our body."[1]

The enlightened friends were, however, by no means inclined to make any such admission, maintaining themselves rather to be good Evangelical Christians. Their rallying cry was "Freedom within, not without, the church!" The Catholic church, like the secular authority, had of late, for the most part, been satisfied with securing outward obedience, had been content to insist upon compliance with its prescriptions and forms. This handling of religious life, a treatment which was political rather than religious, unquestionably afforded some protection to doubters and vacillators. But Protestantism, with its far profounder and more living faith, was forced to have recourse to means for the oppression of conscience as soon as it endeavoured to distinguish the faithful from the unfaithful. Thus did it come to pass that this king by whom freedom of conscience was so highly esteemed, had odious doctrinal proceedings instituted against the enlightened friends in order to compel them to admit their unbelief, so that they might then receive the freedom of unbelief. By existing ecclesiastical law he was indubitably within his rights. But he failed to recognise that such religious disputations have never produced any genuine conviction, for the truths of the faith, belonging as they do to the affective sphere, must be lived and cannot be proved. He failed to realise that men differ in respect of the impulse towards faith and in respect of the energy of belief. Taking, as ever, a personal view, he regarded the pastors who were, as he conceived it, "guilty of apostasy from the Christian faith," simply as perjurers.[2] Superintendent Heubner, an honest man and a strict Lutheran, Twesten, and certain other theologians, had in Wittenberg, quite after the sixteenth century manner, to hold a disputation with

[1] Memorial concerning the Enlightened Friends, August 16, 1845.
[2] King Frederick William to Thile, November 29, 1845.

Wislicenus. Rupp in Königsberg, and Archdeacon Krause in Breslau were subjected to similar interrogations. All the accused insisted that in their interpretation of the dogmas of the church they had done no more than exercise the right of Protestant freedom.[1]

Meanwhile the struggle between Hengstenberg and the enlightened friends had continued to rage, and to the king's great distress a party of moderates, persons the soundness of whose religious views was unmistakable, began to challenge the persecuting activities of the orthodox. In August, 1845, Bishop Dräseke, who had just been subjected to such hearty abuse by the Saxon rationalists, and old Bishop Eylert, who had ever been submissive, signed an address to the monarch which had been drafted by Schleiermacher's disciples in Berlin. This document, while deploring the errors of the enlightened friends, entered an urgent protest against their arbitrary exclusion from the church. The memorialists contended that the growth of the church must be a spontaneous development, must be effected with the active participation of the congregations; and that a free growth of doctrinal formulas in the Christian sense was indispensable. Far more strongly phrased was an address voted shortly afterwards by the local authorities of Berlin. Throughout these years the town of Nicolai had shown no desire to participate in the struggles of party life with anything more effective than witticisms and gossip; but it was roused at length when it believed the principles of the enlightenment to be threatened. With pardonable amazement the newspapers of other German territories recorded how this town council, which participated in ecclesiastical affairs solely as patron, and which had always borne the burden of such patronage very lightly, now suddenly plunged into theological controversy, and lodged with the monarch a solemn complaint against Hengstenberg's journals on account of their "Catholic principle." Since the days of the Puritans, a town council interested in theology had been an unknown phenomenon, and in the town hall of Berlin there was no trace of the fervent faith which had characterised the devout of those earlier days. All that had happened was that the growing political opposition had assumed a theological mask. The king was travelling in Pomerania when he received tidings of this "impudent

[1] Snethlage and Twesten, Report of the Wittenberg disputation, May 16, 1845.

address." Greatly incensed, he insisted that its originators must deliver it to him personally.[1] On October 2nd the municipal authorities of Berlin drove to the palace in a long procession of state carriages, and suffered a most ungracious reception. The king chid them because their address censured those only who had remained faithful, and contained no word of blame for the perjurers. He concluded with the assurance that he would bless the day when he would be enabled "to restore the rule of the church into the right hands." For the moment, the Berliners had no inkling as to what the king could mean by this phrase. Addresses from the towns of Breslau and Königsberg were welcomed in a similar spirit, and Bodeslschwingh, much concerned, wrote: "I think it would be greatly preferable, in cases of this kind, were his majesty to leave matters in the hands of his ministers."[2]

By his personal intervention in these party struggles of the church, the king necessarily exposed himself to the gravest suspicion, for the disciples of the modern enlightenment, in their narrow-minded pride, are never willing to believe in an adversary's good faith. Frederick William realised this. It was widely reported, and doubtless on excellent authority, that he had said bitterly during these days: "At the time of the ceremony of allegiance the Berliners were ready to eat me from very love; now they regret that they did not do it." To many persons, the cause of the enlightened friends seemed to be the cause of Protestant freedom. Such was the tenour of an appeal from Halle, signed by Max Duncker, Hinrichs, professor of philosophy, and many other men of moderate views. So inextricable had become the confusion of parties that even old Marheineke was accounted a liberal because he had taken up his pen to attack Eichhorn's ecclesiastical policy, and because as a Hegelian his views were akin to those of the rationalists. Yet in earlier days, in the name of the almighty state authority, he had with equal vigour defended the liturgical writings of Schleiermacher. The general discontent was increased by fresh acts of persecution. David Schulz was dismissed from his position as ecclesiastical commissioner in Breslau because he had subscribed the address sent to the king from that city. In Magdeburg, Erler, a rationalist whose

[1] King Frederick William to Bodelschwingh, September 10, 11, and 13, 1845.

[2] Bodelschwingh to Thile, January 29, 1846.

views were much less advanced, was refused confirmation of his appointment as superintendent because he had attended some of the meetings of the enlightened friends and had thereby forfeited the king's confidence;[1] in Halle, Carl Schwarz, an erudite young theologian, whom it would have been quite unjust to stigmatise as irreligious, was suspended from lecturing until further notice; in Königsberg the reformed congregation spontaneously closed its church because their pastor Detroit, who had refused to read from the symbolical books, had been withdrawn by order of the consistory and had been replaced by another pastor. When Michelet of Berlin related this last incident in a partisan newspaper article, he was threatened with suspension, though he had long been quite inoffensive, and as a Hegelian entirely immersed in dialectical formulas. All these things were done upon the king's express command. Here are Frederick William's actual words: "The impudence of the enemies of the gospel has at length exceeded bounds. *Thorough* and MOST DECISIVE steps *must* and SHALL be taken against them, not only in Königsberg, but also in Halle, Magdeburg, Nordhausen, Berlin, and wherever a lapse from God is in progress and likely to be succeeded ere long by a lapse from the king."[2] Hengstenberg's party considered these petty persecutions inadequate. In the whole world, only one person of note could be found to defend Frederick William's ecclesiastical policy. This was Thomas Carlyle, cousin and namesake of the historian, one of the twelve apostles of the Irvingite sect. His *Moral Phenomena of Germany* contains a spirited but ill-informed panegyric of the Christian monarch.

The morbid irritability of the epoch, an irritability which seems hardly credible to us to-day, was conspicuously displayed when, in January, 1847, Friedrich von Raumer delivered in the king's presence an academic memorial oration in honour of Frederick II. In respect alike of form and of content the address was valueless. It had plainly been suggested by Tholuck's sermon upon the great king, and was designed in addition to give certain gentle hints to the government of the day. This polemic aim was, however, barely noticeable, for the speaker in his dull and happy-go-lucky manner, continually rung the changes upon a single idea, that everyone must seek happiness after his own fashion. Nevertheless, the excited

[1] Two Cabinet Orders to Eichhorn, end of December, 1845.
[2] King Frederick William to Thile, January 4, 1847.

hearers discovered a personal application in every innocent word. From the benches behind the monarch guffaws were heard when Raumer referred to the good-natured but obstinate princes who desired in all respects to rule in accordance with their convictions, and referred also to those sovereigns of greater stature who were all able to recognise the value of individuality. The court left the hall in high dudgeon. The behaviour of the academy was no less contemptible than it had been many years earlier when it had closed its doors against Hegel. Moved at that time by personal malice, it was now swayed by craven fear, and addressed to the monarch an extremely servile and unworthy letter of exculpation. Even Humboldt was sufficiently the courtier to describe the wearisome speech as "indecorous." Raumer thereupon resigned his membership although Frederick William had speedily recovered his equanimity and had made good humoured fun of his academicians' excuses.[1]

Thus encountering hostility in all directions, the king busied himself all the more zealously with the edict of toleration, which was to enlighten the world concerning the two fundamental ideas of his ecclesiastical policy. He hoped to safeguard the Old Prussian freedom of conscience for every one of his subjects, whilst simultaneously purging the Evangelical church of all open unbelief. For nearly two years, from July, 1845, discussions continued upon this topic, in the ministry of state, in the council of state, and with a number of theologians. From the first the king laid down the rule that church property belonged to the entire church, not to the individual congregations, so that dissenters had no possible claim upon any such property. The contention was legally untenable. It was based upon an extremely dangerous principle. It vied in its extravagance with the old pretensions of the Roman curia. Carried to its logical consequences, it would have reestablished the dominion of the Teutonic Knights in the duchy of Prussia.[2] The question of civil marriage was one of especial difficulty. The mulishness displayed by the Catholic priests in the Cologne episcopal dispute, the new sectarianism, the increasing mixture of religions resulting from the greater mobility of the population, the religious indifference of large strata of the people, in a word, all the experiences of recent

[1] King Frederick William, Draft for a reply to the academy, March 7, 1847.

[2] Thile to Eichhorn, Savigny, Bodelschwingh, and Uhden, June 13, 1845.

years, made it positively incumbent upon the state to introduce civil marriage in one form or another. Were the crown to take action promptly, the inevitable reform might still have been effected without giving any offence to the religious sentiments of pious persons, for it could have been arranged that civil marriage was only to be required as a last resort, whenever religious solemnisation was opposed by the officiant or by the parties concerned.

Such thoughts were forced upon the king's attention by a deplorable incident which wounded him in his holiest feelings. Young Dr. Falkson of Königsberg, an estimable man, a moderate liberal of Jacoby's circle, wished to marry a Christian girl, whilst himself remaining a Jew, although he was far from accepting the more positive tenets of his coreligionists' faith. A marriage of this kind was forbidden by the civil code (Part II, Chap. I, § 36), the relevant section being quite unambiguous, and having been similarly interpreted by all the courts. Even Rupp, the preacher of the free congregation, refused to solemnise the marriage. All good Protestants were united in considering it scandalous that upon purely personal grounds this Jew should endeavour to filch the blessing of the Evangelical church. Despite reiterated petitions, the crown refused to tamper with the law, and Falkson was thereupon married in Hull by an Anglican clergyman. The king naturally regarded this as "a gross contempt of Prussian law." He added: "The marriage can be recognised only if the two parties take a legal pledge to have their children baptised and educated as Christians. If they will *not* do this, they must be instructed to *emigrate* to the land where they were married. In this country they must not be allowed to remain together for four-and-twenty hours, or rather, their offspring must in advance be declared bastards." Instructions were then given to Bunsen to make enquiries in England, and perhaps to ask the primate to declare the marriage null. But this move proved fruitless, for the English church has always felt more closely akin to Judaism than has German Protestantism. The Prussian courts were at length compelled to intervene,[1] although in view of their liberalism the king had little confidence in them. "Our courts," he wrote to Bunsen, "are in all ecclesiastical affairs worse than bad; they are, that is to say, ignorant, and are at the

[1] King Frederick William to Thile, August 27, 1846, and February 10, 1847; Bunsen's Reports, January 25, 1847, and subsequent dates.

same time determined to interpret the law in the most unecclesiastical manner possible." His suspicions proved groundless. Falkson's marriage was, as the law directed, annulled by two of the courts, but the legal proceedings were ultimately interrupted when the constitution of 1848 altered the basis of legislation.

Yet despite his anger, the king could not but feel that the existing laws were no longer adequate to the needs of the time. He wrote as follows to Bunsen: "I cherish the design (though it is still only *in gremio*) that such mixed, swinish, and apostate marriages shall not be forbidden in the future, . . . but that Christians shall be strictly prohibited from having marriage solemnised in the synagogue, and that Jews shall be forbidden with no less strictness to have marriage solemnised in church. The idea is that such marriages should take place before a judge, and the same course must be adopted for the marriage of all those who have left the territorial church. Speaking generally, I am strongly in favour, not of civil marriage in the French sense, but of the declaration of a lawful marriage before a judge." He eagerly returned to this idea of a "quasi-civil marriage," but insisted that this must have nothing in common with the institutions of "revolutionary France." [1] But it soon transpired that his thoughts upon such matters were far freer than those of most of his advisers. He therefore made up his mind that the great question of civil marriage should be shelved for the time being, and decided to content himself with mitigating the prescriptions for the marriage of dissenters. Here too, however, he encountered vigorous opposition. Several of the ministers considered the monarch's plans much too broad-minded. Snethlage, the court chaplain, a strongly religious but far from fanatical Westphalian who had speedily acquired the king's confidence, demanded as a minimum that the religious solemnisation of the marriage of dissenters should invariably precede the civil ceremony, for in default of this the Christian state would be indirectly recognising sectarian ceremonies.

After comprehensive negotiations it was at length agreed that when persons of the tolerated sects desired to marry they should first be cited before the civil authorities, should next have the marriage solemnised in accordance with the

[1] King Frederick William to Bunsen, January 16, February 10 and 12, 1847.

custom of their sect, and that the marriage should finally receive civil recognition by the entry of the particulars in the register of the courts.[1] In other respects the draft of the patent of religions presented by Eichhorn coincided closely with the prescriptions of the civil code.[2] Nevertheless, to many of the orthodox it seemed a dangerous innovation. In the council of state, President Gerlach strenuously opposed its adoption, saying that it would never do "unreflectingly to accept as church and marriage everything which chose to pass itself off by such names." At the eleventh hour he urgently implored his royal friend to refrain from promulgating this ill-omened law, which would, said he, favour apostasy.[3] But the king was firm. The Patent concerning the Formation of new Religious Societies was signed on March 30, 1847. It secured full civil rights and honours for all dissenters as soon as their new religious community was approved by the state. Sects whose doctrines were "in agreement in essential respects" with those of either of the two great religious parties which had concluded the peace of Westphalia, were to be enabled, like the Old Lutherans, to discharge their ceremonial functions with full legal efficiency. Other sects were merely tolerated, and must comply with the new prescriptions relating to quasi-civil marriage.

The patent established clarity at length where legal relationships had been obscure. But the king received thanks from no one, for it was generally feared that the liberty so magnanimously granted to the dissenters was to serve merely as a means for realising the doctrinaire ideal of a visible church of believers, and for expelling doubters from the territorial church. And this is what actually happened. Rupp, Uhlich, and Wislicenus, with their respective adherents, had in the interim formed free congregations. The same course had been followed by Baltzer, the preacher of Nordhausen, an excellent and pious man, known for his verbose poem:

> Luther's spirit makes you free
> From illusion's tyranny!

[1] Thile's Report, July 15, 1845. King Frederick William to Thile, December 13; Protocol of the ministerial conference, December 13; Snethlage to Thile, December 14 and 16; Thile's Reply, December 16, 1846.

[2] Eichhorn, Essay upon the Patent of Religions, July 15; Memorial concerning the Patent of Religions, December 14, 1845.

[3] Ludwig von Gerlach to King Frederick William, December 14, 1846, February 23 and March 30, 1847; Ministerial Protocol, December 20, 1846.

All of these were now compelled to leave the territorial church. In addition, Rupp was expelled from the Gustavus Adolphus Union because the majority was no longer willing to regard him as a Christian. The king was especially displeased with Uhlich. Frederick William termed Uhlich ungrateful, feeling that he had shown the preacher "unexampled consideration," in that he had not interfered with Uhlich's appointment at Magdeburg.[1]

At first the Magdeburg community throve abundantly, containing five thousand members, and engaging in numerous works of Christian charity. But the old truth soon became plain in this case as in that of all other free congregations that a church cannot be founded upon negotiations. At any rate among the Germans, who have never had much inclination towards sectarianism, small separatist churches can only maintain themselves when they exhibit the energy of mystical rapture, of inspired faith. But of neither of these qualities was there any trace here. The rude critical methods of the untrained reason forced the free congregations from one negative to another. Before long some of them had rejected all dogma, whilst others had renounced the sacraments. In Magdeburg for a time an unbaptised Jew collaborated. Wislicenus' congregation at Halle actually ceased to term itself a religious community, and its meetings were carried on to the accompaniment of the cheerful strains of the piccolo.

Following the Saxon example, the meetings of the enlightened friends were forbidden in Prussia as early as August, 1845. This soon put an end to the eager interest of the inquisitive public. Now political questions absorbed all the passion of the day, and the free congregations were thereby drawn within the vortex of political organisation. Religious excitement had been but a fire of straw; the flames soon subsided, and most of the members of the new communities passed over into the democratic camp. Dulon, Uhlich's friend, a preacher who had removed to Bremen, was an apostle of the most extravagant radicalism, although Uhlich himself did not completely abandon even in political matters his middle-class honesty. Within a few years all that remained of the enlightened friends was a handful of petty deistic or atheistic associations which contributed absolutely nothing to the religious

[1] King Frederick William to Eichhorn, June 3, 1846, to Thile, April 19, 1847.

life of the nation. In the long run, therefore, these dissenters, like the German Catholics, succeeded merely in promoting the triumph of their unconditional adversaries. Hengstenberg seemed to have been right when he predicted that every lapse from a strict creed must necessarily lead to anarchy. Persons of a more liberal and gentler judgment, like the devout Bethmann-Hollweg, could not but admit that the king and his ecclesiastical policy had been partly responsible for these distressing incidents. A little more wisdom and a little more Christian patience might well have sufficed to secure the retention within the territorial church of "poor unfortunate Uhlich," and of many others of the same way of thinking, men no less upright. Thus, perchance, radical extravagances might have been averted.

§ 5. THE FIRST PRUSSIAN GENERAL SYNOD.

The king's confidants had known for a long time whose were "the right hands" to which the king proposed to entrust his ecclesiastical authority. Even before his ascent to the throne he had in a detailed letter expounded to Bunsen how Prussia's Evangelical church was to reconstitute itself from within, in accordance with the example of the early Christian church. He wished that the bishops, in conformity with early Christian custom, should play a direct part in the cure of souls. The bishoprics, therefore, must be of extremely modest dimensions—"churches" of approximately the same size as the existing superintendents' areas, and numbering about three hundred and fifty for the whole of Prussia. The bishops were to be consecrated by the laying on of hands in an unimpeachably apostolic manner, so that the first Prussian bishops must be consecrated by those of England or of Sweden, and would then be able to transmit the episcopal virtue. Frederick William was never able to free himself from this Roman Catholic outlook, and he absolutely refused to admit that it conflicted with the fundamental ideas of Protestantism. Subordinate to the bishops there were to be presbyteries of pastors and laymen, who were, however, to be servants of the church, not elected representatives. In the next grade were to be deacons for the service of the altar and for the care of the poor. Lowest of all came the congregations of the faithful, the real participators in the word and the sacra-

ment. Superior to the bishops there were to be about thirteen metropolitans, occupying the ancient episcopal sees of evangelical Prussia with chapters which were to assume the powers of the preexistent consistories. Highest of all, finally, came the prince archbishop of Magdeburg, primate of Germany, with a supreme chapter which was to replace the ministry of public worship and education. All that was left for the monarch was a formal protectorate, and the right of confirming the decisions of the great territorial synods.

The impracticability of this plan was glaring. Indeed, Frederick William himself regarded it as one of his many midsummer night's dreams. But Eichhorn, being an experienced man of affairs, was aware of the only way whereby the old and rigid territorial system could be abolished. He did not succeed in inducing the monarch to abandon the long-cherished scheme, for here no one could have seen successful. Eichhorn was, however, able to persuade Frederick William to pave the way for the independence of the territorial church by a freer development of its existing institutions. From 1841 onwards, therefore, the circle synods, which in the east had almost ceased to exist, were revived; and in 1844 the provincial synods were summoned. Next year, the powers of the consistories were enlarged, and henceforward these bodies had presidents of their own, whereas heretofore their independent work had been practically confined to the examination of candidates for the ministry, whilst the government had supervised the actual work of administration in the ecclesiastical field.

All these changes were effected amid the tacit opposition of most of the ministers. To Count Arnim and to those of his colleagues who, like himself, had at one time been official chiefs of provincial governments, since their minds were still dominated by bureaucratic tradition, independent ecclesiastical authorities were positively inconceivable. A more serious trouble was that Frederick William himself regarded with much suspicion the free and healthy self-government in religious matters which was beginning to flourish in Rhineland and Westphalia.[1] These presbyteries were too modern for his taste; they reminded him too strongly of the godless representative system. Not to them did he desire to entrust the management of the church, but to the congregation of the faithful, to the "church." Vainly did Thile endeavour to convince

[1] See vol. IV, pp. 184 and 185.

him that such congregations united in the faith were to-day few and far between.[1] Frederick William held firmly to his view that the great idea of the Evangelical priesthood would be defiled if indifferents and unbelievers were allowed to participate in the elections and to hold office. He was quite unable to grasp that this idealistic doctrine could not be realised without hypocrisy and unevangelical coercion. On the other hand, in his dread of the Roman church, he was unwilling to concede to the presbyteries of the west even so much as a reasonable power of self-defence in religious matters, and he forbade them to exclude from ecclesiastical office fathers who had so far forgotten their duty as to allow all their children to be brought up as Catholics.

But time pressed. In view of the spread of sectarian movements, and in view of the greatly increasing power of the ultramontane party, it was essential that the evangelical territorial churches of Germany should endeavour to fortify themselves from within and to join each with the others to present a united front. Among the first to recognise this necessity was the king of Würtemberg, who, though personally indifferent in religious matters, had keen political insight. He had been gravely concerned by the clericalist intrigues in his own realm and by the ultramontane policy of the neighbouring court of Bavaria, with which he was ever at feud. As early as April 28, 1843, he sent to Rochow, Prussian envoy in Würtemberg, a holograph letter covering a memorial wherein he urged upon the Prussian government the formation at the Bundestag of a new corpus evangelicorum. The Protestant courts were to unite upon a common religious policy whose chief aim was to be defence against the encroachments of the church of Rome. In this form the Würtemberg proposal was unacceptable. Of old the corpus evangelicorum had served the Protestants as a means of defence against the Catholic majority in the Reichstags. But now, when only six of the reigning princes were Catholics, such a league within the league threatened merely to prove a source of disunion. Moreover, the Protestant courts could not unreservedly join forces seeing how extensive were the differences in their respective religious policies? Frederick William, therefore, through the foreign office, returned a discreetly worded refusal, but expressed his willingness for a discussion of the Protestant ecclesiastical

[1] Thile to Eichhorn, June 15, 1844.

system in general.[1] The Swabian king's anxiety was, however, so great, that he found it impossible to rest content with this negative. He was fully informed regarding the intrigues of the ultramontanes; he knew that the emissaries of the Munich "congregation" were busily at work all over the world, even in Ireland; when his own consistory issued an exhortation to Protestant pastors, urging them, while remaining loyal to their creed, to be tolerant in their attitude towards persons of other faiths, this utterance was made the theme of scornful comment by the clericalist press of Bavaria. Faced by such enemies, he considered it needful that at the Bundestag the Protestant crowns should make common cause to insist upon a discussion of the threatening situation of the Protestants in Austria and Bavaria, and of the alarming pretensions of the Roman church. The policy of Berlin, however, was to avoid anything that might irritate the Vatican, and Frederick William refused to consider an interpellation at the Bundestag as anything but an "ultima ratio."[2] Upon this second rebuff, King William abated his demand, and, acting upon the advice of Grüneisen, the court chaplain, was content to ask that Prussia should invite the Protestant governments to discuss questions of ecclesiastical organisation. At the very outset of these protracted negotiations, Eichhorn had mooted this idea of an "inward unification" of the German territorial churches. It was now expounded by Ullmann in his booklet *The Future of the Evangelical Churches of Germany*, a work whose perusal gave much satisfaction to the king of Prussia.[3]

Thus was revived the old idea, an idea that had never been completely lost, of a national Protestant church for Germany; but unfortunately the revival occurred in days when the realisation of the design was impracticable. Early in 1846 the delegates of all the Protestant governments of Germany assembled, at Prussia's invitation, to hold a free "Evangelical Conference" in Berlin. Bethmann-Hollweg's personal worth, deep religious faith, and extensive knowledge of legal details, soon secured for him the effective leadership of the conference. It was, however, impossible to hope for any immediate results, for the history of the various countries

[1] Bülow's Report, May 27; Thile's Report, May 27, 1843.

[2] Rochow's Reports, Stuttgart, June 14 and November 17, 1844.

[3] King Frederick William to Thile, February 20 and November 11, 1845. Cf. O. Mejer's excellent monograph upon Minister Eichhorn (Biographical Section, pp. 319 et seq.)

had been so full of confusion that they differed fundamentally in respect of their ecclesiastical institutions. Moreover, particularist obstinacy was conspicuous. Frederick William's episcopal "churches," with their presbyters and deacons, secured no support in the assembly, which was equally unwilling to approve the proposals brought forward by Würtemberg.[1] After six weeks, the deliberations closed without any definite result. Nevertheless, the premature attempt did not prove entirely fruitless, for the Eisenach conferences were an issue of the Berlin meeting. These conferences were to assemble at regular intervals under Bethmann-Hollweg's presidency, doing much to clarify the reinvigorated religious life of Germany.

Since for the time being, however, nothing had been achieved, it seemed all the more advisable to settle the organisation of the Prussian territorial church. The first Protestant general synod was summoned at Whitsuntide, 1846. It consisted of thirty-seven pastors and thirty-eight laymen, being composed of the superintendents general, of representatives of the theological and legal faculties of the universities, and of certain persons, some clerical and others lay, nominated by the ecclesiastical authorities of the provinces. It thus presented the aspect of an assembly of notables which, though hardly competent to give formal expression to the will of the church, was nevertheless, through its prestige, its perspicacity, and its experience, well enabled to pave the way for the future church organisation. This was all that Frederick William desired for the moment. He did not as yet suggest the elaboration of any plan of organisation, merely asking the members of the synod "to express their views." Once again, however, his excellent intentions were odiously misinterpreted. The middle classes of the larger towns in eastern Prussia had been greatly aroused by the affair of the enlightened friends; open-air meetings had actually been held in Berlin in honour of Ronge. After all the confused freethinking oratory of these years, it was not unnatural that the monarch's ecclesiastical plans should be received with scorn and with impudent witticisms. When the bronze groups of the horse-tamers were placed upon the new palace terrace, the current jest was that the king could not have his Hengstenberg close enough [Hengst = stallion]. By Varnhagen and his circle the general synod was condemned

[1] Snethlage to Thile, February 5; Thile's Report to the king, February 5, 1846.

in advance as a body of laymen playing at priestcraft. Ten towns furnished instructions in the spirit of the fashionable enlightenment to the burghers who had been summoned to the general synod. The Magdeburgers assured Grubitz, town councillor of that city, that they could not recognise the assembly as representative of the territorial church, and they instructed him to demand a presbyterian and synodal organisation "based upon free election from below." The king was cut to the heart when he learned that this venerable seat of the martyrs of Protestantism, which he had selected as the prince-primate's see, was so full of "pagans." He considered that the Magdeburgers' written instructions were characterised by "modern misunderstanding or scientific ignorance, and indeed by incitement to disobedience." In the first flush of his wrath he threatened "to place himself above the law" and to suspend the freedoms of Magdeburg.[1] With difficulty was he appeased, but ere long the unbridled censoriousness of the opposition was outvied by the behaviour of the general synod. In an inaugural address, Eichhorn explained that never since the days of the reformation had Germany witnessed such an assembly. Never since then, he said, had any German sovereign so confidently encouraged the free development of the church. True enough, that, after the many successes of the papacy, German Protestants could now draw a breath of relief, and could rejoice in the spiritual forces displayed in this church assembly. It was the first joint representation of all the Prussian provinces, the ecclesiastical prototype, as it were, of the proposed united diet. The breeze from the west, which was now everywhere circulating, naturally blew with especial freshness on this occasion, for the Protestants of Rhenish Westphalia had unquestionably outstripped the east in the development of their ecclesiastical organisation. Only one man at the synod was a representative of the old rationalism, von Wegnern, titular chancellor of the [old] kingdom of [East] Prussia, who declared with modest candour that other opinions could hardly be expected from an East Prussian of his years. Persons of strictly religious views could command little more than one-fifth of the votes. The majority represented various shades of the theology of mediation, and all agreed in appealing to

[1] Despatch from the town councillors and churchwardens of Magdeburg to Town Councillor Grubitz (with marginal notes by the king), May 16; King Frederick William to Thile, May 29; Thile's Report, June 18, 1846.

the authority of Schleiermacher. The assembly, therefore, was from the outset attacked no less fiercely by the enlightened friends than it was attacked by Hengstenberg's *Kirchenzeitung*. A Lutheran pastor from the Wupper valley spoke of it pithily as a "synod of robbers." The much respected leader of the majority was Nitzsch, at one time a teacher in the Wittenberg seminary, but during his many years' subsequent residence in Bonn intimately acquainted with the religious self-government of the west. No one could seem more competent than he to promote the reconciliation of the Lutheran land of the east with the fundamental ideas of Calvinistic ecclesiastical organisation. Universally esteemed for his profound learning, he was valued no less for his pious Christian spirit, which ever led him to conceive that all differences on doctrinal points could be resolved in devotion to the person of the Saviour. Nitzsch was now at the zenith of his fame, but also at the turning point of his career, for it was soon to become apparent that whilst Eichhorn shared his views, the king held different opinions.

Frederick William welcomed the synod in an extravagant address, charging the members to direct their gaze beyond the confines of the territorial church, and even beyond the limits of the evangelical confession. In the spirit of primitive, apostolic, universal Christianity, they were to announce to all Christians that the Evangelical church of Prussia was willing to admit to its holy table the faithful of all creeds, and would sever itself from unbelief alone. It was impossible for Nitzsch and his friends to approve so sharp a distinction between believers and unbelievers, and it speedily became obvious that the king and General Thile sedulously avoided conversation with the suspect Bonn professor.

The monarch's suspicions were heightened by the discussions concerning the doctrinal obligations of the pastors. The union had succeeded in coming to an understanding on this matter solely because it had been nothing more than a community for worship and for the sacraments, and had not attempted to effect a complete community of belief. The general synod, however, attempted to state a religious formula for all the pastors of the territorial church, though it was to be left open to the individual congregations to impose upon their preachers the acceptance of additional articles of faith. Nitzsch wished that the formulas should be so broadly conceived

that every Protestant would be able to accept them, and that their drafting should also make them proof against objection on the part of the living science of the day. For him, even the Apostles' Creed was too narrow. Following his subjective scientific conviction, he proposed a yet simpler formula which, though couched in biblical phraseology, was open to manifold interpretations. The well-meaning attempt was foredoomed to failure, for its learned originator, though widely experienced in the practical details of ecclesiastical life, failed on this occasion to give due weight to the energy of popular belief. German theology was the most erudite of all the theologies, and was readily inclined to overestimate the importance of learning in the church. Should a simplification of the Apostles' Creed be hazarded, should this most ancient and venerable of all the creeds of Christendom be modified, though merely in point of form, a few hundred cultured persons would perhaps be satisfied, but the radicals would not be disarmed, whilst millions of persons, simple-minded but strong in the faith and just as important to the church as any scholar, would be wounded in their pious consciences. Such a venture could be successful only when undertaken by a reformer himself strong in the faith, and sustained by the joyful consensus of the entire Protestant nation. It was quite beyond the competence of this sceptical and enquiring generation.

Those of strictly religious views were strong opponents of the suggestion. Von Thadden-Trieglaff, the Pomeranian Lutheran, a conservative hotspur who shortly afterwards seceded from the territorial church, was by no means wrong in his paradoxical contention that the proposed way would lead to hierarchy. In truth it was the "papacy of the scholars" so frequently attacked by the pietists which was now, doubtless with the best intentions in the world, endeavouring to impose its critically enlightened faith upon the Protestant congregations. Like the bourgeoisie in the French state, so in the German Protestant church did the intelligentsia attempt to gain supreme control, naïvely mistaking itself for the entire nation. Even Stahl, who at that time still recognised the union as an accomplished fact, was serious in his warning that the church, whilst it might preserve silence in difficult times, must not speak ambiguously. Twesten, though a personal friend of Nitzsch and interested in the same branch of scholarship, insisted that it would never do to violate the Christian populace

with the forces of theological science. Julius Müller of Halle and Dorner of Königsberg supported the proposals with eloquence and ability. Count Schwerin, and Sydow, the Berlin preacher, who belonged to the Schleiermacherian left, declared themselves at the outset, in the name of Protestant freedom, opposed to a binding obligation to teach any particular doctrine; but subsequently, in the course of the animated and thoughtful discussions, their views became approximated to those of Nitzsch. Ultimately, by a considerable majority, there was adopted a simplified formula of ordination which was by no means in harmony with the spirit of the union, however broad-minded the method of its interpretation. Now majority decisions possess meaning and value only when they relate to matters concerning the active life, and when the vote is intended to show which side is taken by the greater number. As regards matters of faith, the majority means just as little as it means in respect of matters of science. The minority upon this religious question did not consider itself defeated, for it had not been overthrown by intellectual weapons. Besides, how could anyone imagine that the king would agree to a weakening of the old articles of faith? Strauss, the court chaplain, an enthusiastic pietist, thoroughly familiar with Frederick William's views, explained very clearly whilst the discussions were still in progress that the synod was wasting its time.

The unlucky dispute concerning doctrinal obligation was unfortunately detrimental to the main work of the general synod, which was to consider proposals for ecclesiastical organisation. Yet how little prepared was the crown for the undertaking of this great task. Hardly a word was said anent the small episcopal "churches" which the king desired to create. Eichhorn left it to the assembly to make its own suggestions, and the majority of the members spontaneously united upon the idea of building further on the foundations of the existing organisation. No one suggested the abolition of the consistorial system of the east. The proposal was to supplement and invigorate it with the Presbysterian and synodal institutions of the west. Here Nitzsch's marked organising ability could be turned to good account. Bethmann-Hollweg, who now likewise belonged to Rhineland, supplemented Nitzsch's efforts with a thorough knowledge of law; whilst Landfermann came to the assistance of both with abundant experience of

life in the western provinces. The upshot was a well thought out and unquestionably practicable proposal. The consistories were to remain in existence, and at their head was to be created a supreme consistory as the ultimate authority for the maintenance of discipline in the church and for the counselling of the sovereign. Each congregation was to have a presbytery, elected by all the Christian heads of households after unauthoritative nominations had been made by the churchwardens. Above these were to come circle synods and provincial synods, and finally the general synod. All were to contain both clerical and lay members. They were not to be established in accordance with the principles of the political representative system, but were to be so constituted that as a rule none but well-informed persons, tried servants of the church, could belong to them. The attempt was thus made to give the congregation the rights that were their due, whilst excluding indifferent and inexperienced persons from membership of the synods. The fundamental ideas of these reforms were so perdurable, so admirably inspired with vital energy, that Emil Herrmann was able to adopt them with no more than trifling alterations when, a generation later, he was ultimately able to effect the reorganisation of the ecclesiastical system.[1]

For the present there was no hope of anything of the kind. Day after day during three months the members of the synod had scaled the hundred steps to take their seats in the old palace chapel. Ignoring the intense heat of this great vintage year, they had continued their laborious sittings, until finally, on August 29th, the assembly was summarily dismissed. Frederick William at times himself deigned to jest regarding his supreme episcopal authority, which he would so gladly have surrendered into the "right hands." When, overburdened with affairs of state, he had greeted the synod with the impromptu address with which he had himself been far from pleased, he wrote humorously: "A fresh proof that our summus episcopus is a creature of no great account!!!!!!!" [2] Nevertheless, he considered it his duty to exercise this authority to the full, as long as he still possessed it. In his opinion the decisions of the general synod would not promote the

[1] This is obvious to anyone who compares the synod's proposals with the reorganisation ultimately effected; but apart from this, what is said in the text is based upon information given to me in numerous conversations by my late friend Emil Herrmann.

[2] King Frederick William to Thile, June 13, 1846.

welfare of the church. He regarded the new formula of ordination as unchristian, and he consequently looked upon the proposals for organisation with suspicion. He acceded with considerable unwillingness, some months later, to Eichhorn's urgent request that Nitzsch should be summoned to Berlin as Marheineke's successor. Then, as formerly, he avoided all intimacy with the man whom he considered leader of the opposition party in the church, and Nitzsch's work in Berlin was never so fruitful as it had been on the Rhine. Vainly did Eichhorn endeavour to secure the confirmation of the synodal decrees. Hengstenberg, meanwhile, continued to fulminate his accusations, whilst old Gossner complained that the new doctrinal obligation would overthrow the walls of the church, and would enable unbelievers to enter in crowds. The liberal press, on the other hand, was indifferent or spiteful, whilst in other German lands, where the Prussian union had long been in ill odour, Lücke of Göttingen was almost the only noted theologian to express cordial approbation of the synod's work. In the end, all that work was shelved. The king would neither resummon the prorogued general synod nor dissolve it.

Of all the proposals for religious organisation, one only took effect, that for the formation of a supreme consistory, for it was the secret design of the monarch that this body should constitute the counterpart to the proposed conference of Catholic bishops. Thus isolated, thus divorced from the synodal institutions, the new supreme ecclesiastical authority seemed to be nothing more than a reinforcement of the old consistorial system, the very thing of which people wished to rid themselves. Even moderates, therefore, were adverse to it, regarding it as a hierarchical power. It assembled in February, 1848, and had held but a single sitting when it was washed away by the waves of revolution. Thus everything the king undertook miscarried, and even quiet spirits could no longer help entertaining the gloomy expectation that a storm was needed to clear the sultry atmosphere of these days.

CHAPTER V

REALISM IN ART AND SCIENCE.

§ I. POLITICAL POETRY.

THE religious struggles of the day were frequently obscured and falsified by political arrières pensées, and the spirit of this worldly epoch was more faithfully reflected in literature. Here there still persisted the best inheritance from Young Germany, the impulse towards the real, towards modern life. Political passion, intimations of an approaching transformation, exercised so powerful an influence upon every serious mind, that even science was seldom able altogether to escape the trend. Artistic meditation was far from easy to a generation so unrestful, so filled with excitement. Nevertheless, the sense of form began unmistakably to grow stronger after the desolate æsthetic savagery of the thirties. The dominion of the sovereign feuilleton had been broken. The lumber of hasty critiques, topical sketches, capriccios, and semi-novels, the whole cloudy mixture of poesy and prose which had been regarded as clever during the previous decade, now seemed vapid and stale. Renewed was the old experience that time is merciless to things created in its own despite. Even the witty impudence of the Jews had lost its power over the reading world. It was true that the number of Jewish journalists had notably increased, and if a youthful author desired the applause of the press it was essential that he should carefully avoid giving offence to Jewish vanity But the old leaders of the literary chorus, Börne, Gans, and Rahel, were dead, whilst Heine's best days had long been over. New writers of talent were coming to the fore, almost all of German blood, almost all inspired with that youthful lyrical enthusiasm which had ever been lacking to young Germany. Like their predecessors, they regarded themselves as champions of liberty, and they armed their muse in the panoply of a political trend. None the less, there

was a reawakening of delight in metaphor and in rhyme. Criticism and jest no longer sufficed; the poets of the new time luxuriated in the euphony of verse; and, were it only in the nobility of artistic form, they showed their superiority to the feuilletonists of the previous decade.

The more vigorous spirits of the Young German movement had long been endeavouring to produce something better than desultory and fugitive creations. They now turned their matured and concentrated energies towards the stage, and were followed in this direction by many of the younger writers. Good acting plays, artistically finished, some indeed unfavourably influenced by the nervous restlessness of the age, but others full of vitality, springing from the very heart of the living present, brought renewed vigour to the decayed theatre, though the revival was unfortunately destined to be ere long arrested by the storms of the revolution. In the field of imaginative literature and poetry, the national enthusiasm of the year 1840 had exercised an astonishingly powerful influence. German national pride was, indeed, less effectively restored than King Louis opined when, in one of his remarkable poems, speaking of "Germans since the year forty," he boasted, "gone now are the days of illusion." In a nation to which even the first beginnings of a serious party life were as yet unknown, it was impossible for arid and aimless radicalism to become altogether extinct. But sanspatrie cosmopolitanism and servile adulation of France were now rarely exhibited with the shamelessness that had been characteristic of the writers of ten years earlier. Most of the younger poets were enthusiasts on behalf of a powerful fatherland, and foreshadowed a splendid future for their country. If for this reason alone, they seemed more estimable than the squires of Börne.

The age was by no means lacking in intelligence and sensibility. Social life was invigorated and warmed by a serener appreciation of material existence. At no other period in this tasteless century was women's dress more charming. The waist was at length indicated in the right place. Above the graceful folds of the skirt, which was not exaggerated in size, the figure rose slenderly and lightly. The hair was smoothed and parted; the arms were bare; the bodice was of a moderately low cut—in a word, natural beauties were tastefully displayed. Everyone talked of the entrancing charm of the duchess of Sagan and of Wilhelmine Schröder-Devrient,

the brilliant singer; everyone had something to say of the gallant adventures of Prince Lichnowsky and of Schwarzenberg "the lansquenet." When the Munichers and the Düsseldorfers were holding their gorgeous artistic festivals, when the young lyric poets foregathered in Unkel, St. Goar, or Bonn, to sing the praises of the Rhine which could never be celebrated too often, then the joy of life welled up. Even at the countless political banquets of the day, amid the turgid verbiage of contemporary catchwords there could often be heard the moving language of a profound and elemental enthusiasm. The German world still believed in ideals. But the sinister forces of irreverent undiscipline, and the malady of the century, the megalomania of the men of half-formed talent, secured free play amid the general anarchy of intelligence. Such men were to be found in every party. Friedrich Rohmer, known as "the Bavarian Catiline," and his dissolute associates were in respect of intellectual arrogance no whit behind the brothers Bauer and the "Freien" of Berlin, who over their cups on one occasion gave utterance to a mighty "pereat Deus!" A. Widmann, a member of Rohmer's circle, when he had awakened from his delirium, described his experiences in a novel, *Tannhäuser.* When this able work was published three years later (1850) in the days of political disillusionment, the sobered readers were hardly able to understand how anyone could ever have admired "this new titanism which preceded our revolution."

In such days there was adequate justification for the half poetical, half patriotic pathos of political lyric verse. When the new poets, in well-rhymed stanzas, implored the nation to cease pouring forth verses, they manifested in this paradoxical utterance what a generation poor in deeds and yet avid of deeds was actually feeling. They believed that they were presenting the Germans with something entirely new, and they regarded with contempt that which Heine had so often derided, the youthful poesy of the War of Liberation. Yet of their elegant and smoothly written poems, few have proved competent for a vigorous survival, as the artless lays of Arndt and Körner, of Schenkendorf and Fouqué have survived. The poets of the great struggle of the nations sang of war, the only form of political activity directly suitable for artistic expression. Their patriotic enthusiasm awakened the eternal and characteristically human feelings of joy in battle and wrath in the fray, of hope for victory and delight in victory. They pursued a definite

end, one readily comprehensible to simple folk, the liberation of the fatherland from the yoke of foreign oppressors. They wrote with dramatic truth, literally, in many cases on the spur of the moment, almost in face of the enemy; and they remained modest, for in times of great deeds, boastful words rouse a blush. The modern peaceful ideals of constitutional freedom, civic equality, and national unity, offered, on the other hand, a far more difficult material, which could be forced into artistic moulds only by means of mighty passion and unwonted grandeur of judgment. Ever present was the danger, for those whose talents were not of the first order, of lapsing into the futility of verbose generality, into the pettiness of partisan hatred, or into the prose of coarse satire.

It was natural enough that the new political poets should appraise themselves too highly, seeing that their brave words were never put to the blush by the contrast with glorious deeds. They regarded themselves as the God-given leaders of the age because even men of virile personality were eager for their lays. Such ardent homage as Herwegh received in his triumphal progress had hardly ever before been given to a German poet by serious-minded men. It almost seemed as if poesy was again proudly to take her place in the centre of our national life. In actual fact, however, this enthusiasm was purely political. The political lays sounded to their hearer like repressed parliamentary speeches, and for this very reason, like the words of the statesman and the journalist, they were subject to the doom of transitoriness. Directly politics broke new trails, these verses seemed out of date, whereas the pure work of art can carve out a world for itself, a world independent of time. To-day, already, it is difficult in retrospect to realise that in the fugitive but by no means futile manifestation of these topical poems the thoughts of a generation whose political will was slowly ripening secured their natural expression.

At bottom, of all the young poets of that day, not one was poorer in original thought or in primitive power of sensibility than Georg Herwegh, the most widely renowned of any. He was termed the lark of the German national springtime, for his *Poems of a Living Man* was the first book wherein, since the days of Anastasius Grün's *Rambles of a Viennese Poet*, the political enthusiasm imported from foreign parts had been linked to the struggles of the fatherland. Deafening and confusing was the sound of these impetuous calls to arms.

Boastful and incredible hyperboles, whose effect was all the greater because they were set in well-roundedv erses, strengthened, the impression that a fierce titan was summoning a degenerate people to a last despairing struggle:

> Is there, then, of swords a dearth ?
> Tear the crosses from the earth !
> God will surely pardon grant !

But there was a lack of profound and serious content. In hardly any of the poems do we find more than a feverish impatience, in revolt against the tedium of the present, angrily railing on behalf of some vague splendour, now inciting to simple riot, now urging war with the Russians and the French, now demanding the fraternisation of all free peoples. The poet's lyrical gifts were most happily displayed in his interspersed non-political poems, as when he described the forebodings of death of the horseman riding forth at dawn, or when, in a sentimental but thoughtful plaint he expressed the desire to pass away as fades the evening glow. His political ideas were almost exclusively derived from Börne's writings, and among the fighters of Old Germany none were more highly esteemed by him than "our saviour" Ulrich von Hutten. The defiant "I have ventured boldly" of his horseman was reechoed in countless poems and newspaper articles, for the fiery and nebulous political idealism of the sixteenth century was accordant with the spirit of this irreligious age, whereas Luther's religious scruples seemed alien. Herwegh's superficial and ready-witted impudence had nothing in common with the thoughtful profundity of the Swabians, and for this reason he was less esteemed in his homeland than in the north. Friedrich Vischer the leading art critic of Swabia, though himself a radical, passed a severe judgment in his able work *Critical Excursions* upon the defective genius of this poet of big words. Herwegh ran early to seed; his light was dazzling but soon waned; immoderate applause was poisonous to this petty, vain soul. The radicals had not taken it amiss when he, the deserter, penned boastful lines expressing his desire to take part in "a cavalry charge"; but they did not forget his piteous complaint "my song is all my wealth," and when he married a rich woman and settled down to an idle, useless life of pleasure, they turned away in disgust, for the hateful spectacle of the demagogue debauchee was still new to the Germans.

All that remained of his poetic gift was his skilful use of form. Being too lazy and too self-centred to learn by experience, his radicalism became inflamed to the pitch of blasphemous effrontery. Four years before the revolution he penned the wild verses:

> Down with taxes, down with tariffs;
> In thought, no less, we'll have free trade!
> Dead in hell is Father Satan;
> God, too, to death his debt has paid!
> Quaff no longer blood from bumpers
> With the church's madness filled!
> Lo, Columbus broke the eggshell
> When to win the earth he willed.

During the Polish rising of 1846 he wrote in a frenzy: "I long for victory to the rebels, and for disgrace to the German flag!" When at length, after pitiful doings in the year of revolution, kindly fortune permitted him to live on into the days of German glory, he continued for years, chiding, cursing, and mocking, to stagger along behind the victorious chariot of the new German empire, drunk with phrases, despised by the thoughtful, and forgotten by the majority of the nation. Beside Herwegh's posthumous volume of *New Poems*, published at Zurich in 1877, the loosely constructed and satirical verses of Hoffmann of Fallersleben seemed honest and innocent for all their clownish folly. How, indeed, can anyone find fault with Hoffmann of Fallersleben, who, in his best hours, could see so clearly into the true heart of his nation; how can anyone blame the man who, without hearth or home of his own, was able in his *Songs for Children* to give so cordial, so truthful, and so simple a depiction of the dream world of German childhood, and who could do it without a single false note of modern preciosity.

The favourite poet of the day, Franz Dingelstedt, author of *The Lays of a Cosmopolitan Nightwatchman*, was made of finer metal. He was less loudly acclaimed than were Herwegh and Hoffmann of Fallersleben, for the Jewish critics spoke slightingly of him in the newspapers, and his poems, which often recalled Platen's in the strictness of their form, were not suited for vocal reproduction. None the less he excelled in wit and humour, in the keen knowledge of the world and of men which is no less indispensable to the political poet than to the historian. Despising futile generalities, he endeavoured

in vivid pictures to convey the crude contradictions of German life, now describing with spirited mockery the priestly regime of Bavaria or the foolish despotic caprices of the princelets in their miniature courts, now delineating with gloomy foreboding the nemesis which awaited the old Guelph ruler and his blind son. His bitterest scorn was reserved for "the city of culture and of tea, of the arts and of whimsies," since the sterile talents of Berlin politics and art filled him with loathing. Utterly regardless of his liberal friends' enthusiasm for the Jews, the "Nightwatchman" ventured frankly to declare that "the unique, the one and only" Rothschild already exercised supreme power in the federal capital. He warned the Germans that the tribe of Judah, eternally complaining, had long ere this massed its forces, "and half for gold, and half by the sale of its servile wits, had purchased from the zeitgeist its word of deliverance." His muse was as relentless as the man himself, but was never impudent. He bowed his head in grateful reverence before Goethe, Platen, and Chamisso. Intense home-sickness breathed from his poems when he sang of the quiet charms of the Weser valley or of the defiant love of freedom animating his valiant Hessian fellow-countrymen. Of those impious spirits whose fierce partisan hatred led them to blaspheme their very fatherland, he asked simply:

> Can one who speaks with German tongue
> Wish harm to German land?

Yet this nobly endowed intelligence was never to enjoy the fullest development of its poetic energies. A man instinct with vitality, handsome, lithe, and loveable, filled with the joy of life and overflowing with courage, he longed to escape from the petty-bourgeois environment of his youthful days, desiring to see the world, to rule in the world, to bask in the world's warmth. When, without ever renouncing his liberal sentiments, he accepted a position as librarian at the court of Stuttgart, for this "tufthunting" [Verhofräterei], as Heine gibingly termed it, he was grossly abused by the straightlaced terrorists of the liberal press, just as Anastasius Grün was reviled as a renegade because, following the custom of his house, he adopted the Austrian title of chamberlain. Subsequently Dingelstedt, in the course of many years spent as director of various court theatres, acquired an intermediate position

between the life of art and the life of high society, a position suited to his temperament. He did excellent service for the stage, but amid the rush of everyday activities he had little time to spare for his own creative work.

These banner bearers were followed by a whole army of lesser poets. Lyric verse, which had for so long led a retired existence in the almanacs specially compiled for feminine consumption, now effected a noisy eruption into the market place, and there was hardly a newspaper which did not from time to time publish a rhymed leading article. As a rule the poetry was utterly subordinated to the political purpose. The fatherland, it was bluntly declared, needs from the poetasters, not the outworn lyrical trifles we have been wont to hear, but merely courage and stalwart sentiments. The tone was almost universally radical, for to art half-measures are uncongenial. One of the rapidly increasing number of discontented, lieutenants who now, wearying of garrison service, were taking to authorship, Friedrich von Sallet, a high-minded enthusiast who unfortunately mistook emotionalism for beauty, voiced the thoughts of nearly all the members of this youthful storming party when, continuing to use the brusque tones of the military word of command, he enquired:

> For sovereign power, or for the people's right?
> For priestly darkness, or for sweet reason's light?
> Republican wilt be, or rather base-born slave?
> Say yes or no, in accents firm and brave!
> Your colours choose!

Quite involuntarily, Ferdinand Freiligrath was drawn into the maelstrom of poetry with a purpose. This Westphalian, a man of feeling with the trusting eyes of a child, had first attracted notice through his masterly treatment of foreign materials. His youthful poems such as "The Lion's Ride upon the Giraffe," "The Prince of Moravia," "The Bandits' Burial," were almost exclusively devoted to the description of completed situations. Though they lacked dramatic movement, they glowed with colour, and were phrased in pithy and arresting language. Strange as the baobab, the gnu, the karroo, and the rest of the exotic frippery, seemed when reset in German verses, the reader could not but feel that this was matter of personal experience, the experience of an intensely German nature When the young poet stood behind the

counter in his retired native city, or when subsequently, as a clerk in Amsterdam, he saw the great vessels from the East Indies come to their moorings beside the Buitenkant, he was filled with yearnings for the storied world of remote latitudes. The brilliant pictorial images which instantly rose before his visual imagination had to be promptly reproduced for the benefit of admiring friends, whilst he himself delighted in them as a boy delights in the wonders of the *Orbis pictus* of the panorama. For him, the remote and the foreign came into close human proximity as soon as he could reconstruct them in pictures. On one occasion, during a bright summer night, he was in bed when a country man related to him the ancient legend that Westphalian legionaries had been on guard by the cross of Christ and had cast lots for the Saviour's vesture. Of a sudden there arose a vision before his eyes how there on Golgotha had been the point of contact between the history of the antique and the history of the modern world. Springing to his feet, he draped the counterpane around him in picturesque folds, exclaiming: "The German in Christ's mantle!" The last verse of his picture poem "The Crucifixion."

When political enthusiasm took possession of him, it was the same impulse towards the lofty, the great, and the wonderful which led him to join the ranks of the radical extremists, and now the revolution, the savagely beautiful victrix in the red cap and with the streaming hair, became his goddess. No less straightforward in hatred than in love, utterly inexperienced in the world of history, he had no patience with what seemed to him half measures. With an ardent passion which did not even disdain the rudest cynicism, he espoused these ideals. In his vigorous "for all that and all that," Ulrich von Hutten's battle cry, "Perrumpendum tandem! Jacta est alea!" had a very different ring from that given to it in Herwegh's graceful verse. When he was lost in his radical dreams, his fervid imagination would even play with the thought of regicide. He described the "proletarian engineer" in the boat that carried the king of Prussia up the Rhine to Stolzenfels. The man asks himself whether he ought not to blow up the ship and to sink it with its august freight. "The steam hisses, but the man rejoins, 'Be still, wrathful element, for the day is not yet come!'" Yet all the time Freiligrath remained a light-hearted and pleasant fellow, interspersing amid his revolutionary menaces innocent lays of wine and the Rhine,

and penning with deep feeling, "Love then, so long as love thou canst." Thus it is impossible to look upon him as no more than a poet with a purpose. Moreover, despite his numerous political follies, his excellent heart saved him from despair of the fatherland. "Lord God in heaven, what a glorious flowering shall one day be the flowering of this Germany," were his thoughtful words as he contemplated the blossoms on the tree of humanity. When he referred to his Germany as a Hamlet, a comparison which became extraordinarily frequent both in verse and in prose after he had first made it current, he added modestly:

> But I, too, am a part of thee,
> Thou laggard and postponer!

Thus was he able to live with living men, and when, in after years, his republican ideals all lay shattered on the ground, when the dream of his youth secured fulfilment at the hands of monarchical authorities, being free from pettiness he was able to rejoice in Germany's new greatness, and his sonorous poet's greeting responded to the bugles of Gravelotte.

Nikolaus Lenau, the German Hungarian, was attracted into the camp of the lyrical contestants, not properly speaking by political passion, but rather by the yearning for spiritual freedom. Melancholy brooded over the ruffled brow and the dark, fiery eyes of this noble, sincere, and amiable dreamer. He was immersed in contemplation of the "earnest, gentle, reflective, unfathomably sweet night"; he hearkened to the mysterious whispering of the boat on the lake; he pondered darkly over the nullity of life, "which one smokes away, sleeps away, fiddles away, and despises all the time." The youthful poems in which he sang the waste and silent heath, the endless sea, the sorrow of young love, the sweet and deadly weariness of misfortune, were sometimes obscure and formless, but were always invigorated by a profound and honestly felt elegiac mood; they sounded as if the gypsies of his native steppes were playing upon their violins a mournful melody. In youth, seeking liberty, he made his way to America; and when, painfully disillusioned with "the land full of nightmare deceptions," he had returned home, he tried his hand at important works.

In loosely constructed, characteristically modern artistic

form of the lyrical epos, which had been familiar to England since the days of Scott and Byron, but which was still little known in Germany, Lenau's genius, combining enthusiasm with an impulse towards nicety of form, was able to secure its freest expression. The harmonious beauty of Goethe's versification was as alien to Lenau as was the master's serene wisdom. Lenau desired, with guiding and liberating words, to awaken mankind to a sense of its deathlessness. Yet to this meditative soul the craving for knowledge was tantamount to a curse. His morbid spirit was torn and martyrised by terrible doubts; his weltschmerz was honestly felt, and ultimately drove him insane. Consequently the doubt which ruled his mind became the real hero of the most effective of his poems, *The Albigenses.* With shattering force he displayed to his readers many of the incidents in this terrible war of religions. The frequent changes in metre, though they endangered the unity of the poem, gave peculiar liveliness to the individual scenes. But this Catholic doubter had no true understanding of the simple evangelical faith in the word wherein is to be found, in essence, the prophetic greatness, the spiritual content, of that wonderful medieval heresy. Depriving his Albigenses of all vivid historical colouring, the poet depicted them as protagonists of an aimless freethought, of a modern and frankly negational outlook. Altogether to the taste of his excitable readers, and a true sign of the times, was the magnificent closing vision of the poem, presenting the whole of history as an unending struggle on the part of freedom against the stupidity of coercion:

> To brave Albigeois now succeed the Hussites,
> Who bloodily requite what those have suffered.
> On Hus and Ziska follow Luther, Hutten,
> The war of thirty years, the Cevennes fighters,
> The stormers of Bastille—and thus it goes!

Heinrich Heine contemplated these transformations in our spiritual life with vexation easy to understand. To this gifted rogue the lofty pathos of the lyrical demagogues could not but appear ludicrous, and he found it impossible to pardon history for treading paths so different from those which he had predicted. The Germans, whom he had reviled on a hundred occasions, were daring to display a will of their own and to impose that will upon "France, the most upright

and most magnanimous of the nations, magnanimous to the pitch of fanfaronade." They actually had the audacity to become a nation, though Heine had once for all sardonically forbidden anything of the kind. The worst count in the indictment was that Prussia, the detested Prussia, had now become the leader of German policy. In his writings, Heine continued to bewail the sleepless nights of exile which, so he declared, had been the fruit of his patriotic love for Germany. Yet all the time he was cheerfully drawing his pension from King Louis Philippe; and since he was thus willing to take France as his paymaster, he was perfectly logical in desiring to have himself naturalised as a Frenchman. The timid Guizot was alarmed, for the poet's heartrending outcries had led him to believe that Heine was persecuted by Germany as a formidable traitor. Anxious to avoid giving umbrage to Prussia, he enquired through Bresson, the French envoy in Berlin, what might be Heine's status vis-à-vis the Prussian government, and what steps, if any, Prussia would be likely to take should Heine become a French subject. On February 17, 1843, a nonchalant answer was returned to the effect that the authorities really did not know whether Heine was still a Prussian subject; some years earlier they had forbidden the circulation of his writings in Prussia, but had never instituted any prosecution against him; if Heine desired to be naturalised as a Frenchman, Prussia had no objection, and should the naturalisation take place, Heine would be granted by Prussia the rights of a Frenchman.[1] This was the unfortunate wretch over whose terrible martyrdom the scribblers of the German press had shed so many tears of blood! Now that Guizot's sole ground for concern had been completely abolished, we may assume with the greatest probability that Heine really became a Frenchman, even though he denied this at a later date; the man who had long been in receipt of French pay is not likely to have boggled at the renunciation of the nationality of the detested Prussian state. Little more than two years later (January, 1845), when Guizot resolved upon the expulsion of the whole staff of the radical German periodical *Vorwärts*, Heine a member of this staff, was expressly excepted because, since he was a naturalised Frenchman, it was impossible to expel him. Can we believe that the French

[1] Despatch from the ministry for foreign affairs to Count Bresson, Berlin, February 17, 1843. See Appendix XXXV.

government, after all that had happened, was misinformed concerning the nationality of a man with whom its relationships had been so intimate?

In the long run, the futile chatter of the feuilleton could not suffice a man with Heine's refined artistic sensibilities. He returned to the writing of poetry, and many of his new songs were no whit inferior to the old. Even in the nosegay of verses which he unashamedly addressed to nine Parisian cocottes, there were to be found a few fresh blossoms. Never before had he preached with such boldness and such vigour his gospel of the glorification of the flesh, as he preached it in the verses:

> The body and the spirit now
> In harmony may dwell,
> The stupid torture of our flesh
> No longer casts its spell.

His *Atta Troll, a Midsummer Night's Dream,* which was to be fantastic and aimless, like love and life, was to counteract the energies of the new political lyric verse, reminding him so distastefully of the Teutonist songs of the War of Liberation. He was unsuccessful in this contest, despite his coinage of the happy catchword "no genius, and yet a character"—for his own temperament had long ceased to move with sufficient freedom for him to be able to give himself up unrestrainedly to the play of humour. *Atta Troll* was far from being what the poet had intended, the last free woodland song of romanticism, for its deliberate campaign against poems with a purpose made it itself a poem of this order. As with all the writer's more ambitious attempts, there was lacking to it unity of mood, no less than a circumscribed artistic composition. Descriptions of Pyrenean landscapes, pictures of the witches' kitchen and of the chase, but in especial political and literary sallies of all kinds, in a word, feuilletonist trifles, were strung upon the slender thread of a foolish and not even witty tale of bears. Though it was rich in fine images, in pungent and bold witticisms, the composition as a whole lacked serenity and brought no feeling of enfranchisement. The forest aroma of the innocent world of fable comported ill with the sulphurous atmosphere of journalistic polemic. The four-footed trochaic metre, which can win force and fire only through the heroic pathos of Spanish grandiloquence, seemed here, when harnessed

for the conveyance of comic material, monotonous and soporific like the babbling of a fountain.

Heine's *Germany, a Winter Fable* (1844), was much freer and more straightforward in style, but was likewise distinguished for obscenity and impudence. It was written by him after revisiting his fatherland, when he had been left entirely unmolested by the authorities. The poem displayed animus throughout, so that it was plain that *Atta Troll* had not been directed against the prosaic degradation of free art, but solely against the particular political trend of the new poets of the time. Most of these youthful prophets were proud to recognise themselves to be sons of a great fatherland. Heine's inclination, on the other hand, now as of old, was to mock at everything German, even though at times he suffered a little from home sickness. Estranged from his nation, he was as void of understanding of the new ideas now stirring the whole of Germany, he was as reactionary towards these ideas, as had been of old Nicolai and the Berlinese champions of the enlightenment vis-à-vis our early classical poesy. Wherever he encountered anything characteristic of the new Germany, he endeavoured to drag it in the dust. On every page of *Germany* he sniggered maliciously as he declared that nothing was coming or ever would come out of Germany. To the victors of Dennewitz and Belle Alliance, who in all the pride of their new helmeted panoply were so soon and for a third time to tread the path of victory to Paris, he uttered the prophetic warning: "The heavy helmet of the middle ages may hinder you when you have to run for it! "But all this scorn and hatred indubitably welled up from the depths of the heart. The light lilt of the rhymed verses, with their seemingly artless rise and fall which was in truth splendidly accordant to the genius of our tongue, gave *The Winter Fable* a swing which was lacking to the more artificial measures of *Atta Troll.* The poet still retained his ancient mastery of the German language, and in Paris his intimates were never wholly satisfied with his French, for one who is perfect master of a single tongue very rarely acquires adequate control over another. In order to bring his visit to the fatherland to a worthy conclusion, Heine in farewell greeting enquired concerning the future of Germany, and found it depicted in the close-stool of Charlemagne. "It was as if one had heaped together the night soil from six-and-thirty fosses!" The poem, one

of the most brilliant and characteristic products of Heine's pen, is an index for the Germans of what severed them from this Jew. The Aryan nations have their Thersites and their Loki, but such a character as Ham, who uncovers his father's nakedness, is known only to Jewish saga.

It is simply unthinkable that an English, a French, or an Italian Jew would ever have had the impudence to defile after this fashion the land of his birth. But the national pride of the Germans, still inchoate, and alternating between undue irritability and callous indifference, endured even this. Whilst men of serious mind turned away in disgust, Heine continued to find admirers among the ranks of radical youth, and before long, in his *Poems of the Time*, he ventured to outdo even the obscenities recorded above. Over the stinking morass of his "Songs in Praise of King Louis of Bavaria," there still shone from time to time the ignis fatuus of an evil wit, but in his mocking lays upon Prussia and its ruling house there was no trace either of humour or of artistic charm. Nothing was evident beyond the "stone him," the "crucify him," the frenzied howling of Jewish hatred. "You must either drown it or burn it," he wrote of Prussia, "the changeling, the monster," employing a wealth of bestial images such as could be furnished by his unclean imagination alone In the like obscene and bestial phraseology did he describe the Hohenzollerns, the race of Frederick the Great: "Brutality in speech; laughter like a horse's neigh; thoughts fit for a stable; gorging like a beast—every inch an animal!" Ere long he became affected with a terrible illness, and was henceforth bedridden. He bore the trouble manfully (though not without announcing to the world, with the loud outcries of a Jewish cheapjack, the tortures of his "mattress tomb"), and remained what he had ever been, a poet, compeller of beauty no less than wielder of baseness. His last walk before he finally took to his bed led him to the Louvre, to the gallery where the statue of the Venus of Milo gleams against the dark-red background. There, before the image of the goddess who had brought him so much sweetness and so much sorrow, he burst into tears—an overwhelming spectacle for everyone with a human comprehension of human error and human fame.

Thus pugnacious political verses were resounding on all sides. Even Adolf Glassbrenner, darling and teacher of the loquacious and democratically-minded lower middle classes of

Berlin, now for once mounted Pegasus. His new *Reynard the Fox* reflected in burlesque images and broad jests the hatred for the Jesuits felt by the enlightened friends in North Germany, but Glassbrenner rarely succeeded in crossing the dividing line between poesy and prose, between sparkling humour and coarse direct satire.

Among the younger lyricists there was but one who, inspired with a proud consciousness of high artistic vocation, ventured to wage war simultaneously against the radicalism of the poets of the time and the frivolity of Heine. This was Emanuel Geibel of Lübeck. He had grown up in the healthy and cultured atmosphere of a pious Protestant parsonage, amid the vigorous bourgeoisie and the great historical memories of the old Hansa town. Thus from early days were his feet firmly planted upon the soil of the Christian faith:

> For me verse springs from the sacred fount
> In the rock whereon the church is builded.

He had travelled through Italy; with his friend Ernst Curtius, the philologist, he had spent a joyful season of poetic ecstasy among the islands of the Ægean; and when those days were remote, he still recalled with longing the burning sun of the south. It was his ambition to restore to German lyric poetry the pure beauty he had breathed in these journeyings, to restore the nobility of form characteristic of his favourite, Platen, to restore these by serious and chaste verses, composed in deliberate contrast with Heine's sportive disregard of form, on the one hand, and with the conspicuous tendentiousness of the political poets, on the other. The critics did not know what to make of him at first; they passed the judgment which he had anticipated when he wrote: "Whoever fails to shout with the crowd is stigmatised as a slave." He was termed the school-girls' poet, for the love-songs of his youth, although they breathed the intense joys and sorrows of personal experience, were not free from sentimental softness. Then came the days when even mature men took delight in the sustained dignity of his thoughtful and well-rounded terze-rime and his sonnets. It is true that the overwhelming power of dramatic passion was denied him, and that he lacked insight into the profoundest abysses of the soul. Almost simultaneously, Geibel and Heine attempted to deal with the fable of Tannhäuser.

Geibel's poem was a finished little work of art, permeated from the first line to the last with the same tone of admonitory melancholy, whereas Heine, after a happy opening, ruined the final impression by feuilletonist witticisms. But the ecstasy of voluptuousness, the mysterious power of feminine beauty to which Father Homer had already applied the epithet of "terrible," the witcheries of the enchantress of the Venusberg, the elemental world of the ardent senses in its effective contrast with the asceticism of the middle ages (the contrast which is in truth the only thing which gives the old saga colour and life)—the loose-living Parisian jester was incomparably better equipped than his more moral opponent to reproduce these with vividness, fire, and beauty.

Geibel detested the mob, detested the radical's illusion of equality, detested those "to whom it is a sin that one should tower above the crowd." With an honest "God help me, I can no other," Geibel told Herwegh to his face that his poems breathed riot. "To build, to fashion, to reconcile" seemed to him better work than to brandish the torch of Herostratus. Nevertheless his heart too was filled with ardour for the greatness of the fatherland, for a free people which should cling firmly to God and to justice. Among the confused dreams of the time, his nobility of mind enabled him to discern the living ideals. Throughout all disillusionments he was able to preserve the ancient imperial dream of his people no less faithfully than he preserved his hopes in the state of Frederick the Great. He was the first of German poets to enter the lists on behalf of the rights of Schleswig-Holstein. He, the conservative, did not hesitate to prophesy for the Italians the coming of an Odysseus as rescuer, and for the Greeks the liberation of the Bosphorus. Though his first poems of the time were almost drowned amid the savage cries of the radicals, he was none the less destined to be the fortunate singer who should herald the coming of the new empire. At that time, indeed, this gentle and thoughtful poet could not free himself from the foreboding of dreadful struggles. He recognised how the quarrels of faction were eating into the marrow of our bones. He saw how many thousands of hunger-stricken persons were thronging the portals of the rich. He uttered a cry of warning: "Germany is sick unto death, and must be blooded!"

§ 2. ROMANCE AND DRAMA.

Ludwig Tieck's last imaginative work, the romance *Vittoria Accorombona*, sounded like a voice from the tomb among these modern struggles. The author completed it shortly before his removal to Berlin. It was unquestionably the maturest, the most carefully considered, of his works. Couched in the strictly historical style, there was little discussion to break the narrative of the horrors of the closing cinquecento, of the misdeeds of that highly cultured generation wherein every strong personality was drawn into the maelstrom of universal political and moral depravity, the generation of those who continued to fight among themselves until Italy sank into a heavy slumber under the foreign dominion. Sensuality always appears in its pagan nudity; crime is deliberate, sure of itself, reckless; the individual's fault is looked upon as the fault of the community at large; the voice of conscience is stilled, every offender saying coldly to his victims, "Cosa fatta capo ha." The critics, who had long detested the sometime opponent of Young Germany, hastened to dismiss with a few sneering remarks anent romanticist hocus-pocus a work which was in truth masterly after its own fashion, and was instinct with the historical spirit.

Yet this unjust censure was not utterly groundless. The present already had a rich life of its own, and had a right to demand the rediscovery of its own sensations even in the description of a foreign world of adventure. This, above all is why Walter Scott's historical romances, fully comprehensible as they were to every reader, secured so enormous a circulation in Germany, although Tieck and the other romanticists would hardly account the greatest narrative fictionist of the century as one of themselves. Among Scott's numerous imitators were many commonplace writers, but also Rehfues, the gifted Swabian, whose romance *Scipio Scicala* gave so faithful and vivid a description of the oppressive Spanish regime in Naples, of the savage renegacy of the Hispano-Turkish naval war, and of the horrible debasement of priestly life in southern Europe, that the Rhenish clergy considered it necessary to have the candid writer sent away from Bonn.[1]

[1] See above, p. 28.

Outsoaring all the rest was Wilibald Alexis (Wilhelm Häring), a Silesian of Huguenot descent who had long been settled in Berlin. He conceived the bold design of competing with Scott, of endeavouring to raise historical romance in Germany to the level of a modern national epos, just as Sir Walter had done for his own homeland. From his Silesian and his French ancestry Alexis had inherited a delight in story-telling, whilst a busy life of affairs had given him an abundant knowledge of men. As early as 1832, long before the historians had gained adequate mastery of the extensive material, he ventured in *Cabanis* to portray the Frederician age. In the pages of this work we rediscover, vividly typified in characters of marked individuality, not merely the contrast already depicted by Lessing between Electoral Saxon refinement and Prussian uncouthness, but also the many other tragical contrasts of those great days, the narrow-minded domestic tyranny of the Berlinese petty bourgeoisie and the free-spirited heroic greatness of the king, the iron discipline of the army and the blusterous intrigues of diplomatist adventurers. Next came romances of the Ascanian and early Hohenzollern times, then of the days when the reformation was making its way into the Marks, and finally of the epoch of the foreign dominion. The characters were all typical of Brandenburg, blunt and harsh, loyal and brave, not so preposterously moral as were most of Scott's heroes, real hearts of oak, from which the timbers for the building of a great power could unquestionably be hewn. How admirably, too, did Alexis reproduce the beauties of the Brandenburg landscape, beauties which had been thrust out of favour by the "herb-salad-verses" of the worthy Schmidt of Werneuchen and by the mockery of Goethe: the stems of the pine trees reddening in the sunset glow, the noonday silence of the sultry and deserted heath, the blue lakes with here and there a solitary oarsman. Such elemental life and strength as old Berlin possessed were never more faithfully presented than by Chamisso and Häring, two men whose blood was half French. A diligent artist, thoughtful and ever careful as to finish, Alexis lacked the masterly certainty of touch which enabled Scott to deal so serenely and successfully with the abundance of his characters. The grand dénouement, wherein Sir Walter always showed his utmost strength, was lacking in the work of the German writer, who never quite escaped the influence of the romanticists

of Tieck's school, and who towards the close of his book would often dreamily let the reins slip from his hands.

Nevertheless these romances of the fatherland contained some genuine pearls of imaginative narration, and they were competent to arouse both artistic and patriotic delight in every middle-class household in the land. But it soon became apparent how important is the question whether a nation feels at one with its history. The Scots without exception lived and thought in harmony with their national romance writer, and they lauded him to the skies. Every Graham, every Scott, every Campbell, every Douglas, felt honoured to meet his clansmen in Sir Walter's novels. To the support of the German author, whose talent was certainly of a lower order than that of his Scottish prototype, there came not even a flicker to compare with these flames of national enthusiasm. The Germans outside of Brandenburg were still utterly ignorant of the early life of the Marks, and this foreign provincial history was simply tedious to them. The Brandenburgers were subject to the intellectual domination of the Berliners, whose mood was cool and unhistorical, so that even the Brandenburgers were little interested in the writer who was peculiarly their own. Alexis was also to make close acquaintance with the ingratitude of the Hohenzollerns, that unpleasing hereditary defect from which King Frederick the Great and Emperor William I alone among Prussian sovereigns were exempt. As far as can be ascertained, during the period with which we are now concerned, the author of *The Roland of Berlin* and *Herr von Bredow's Breeches* received no other sign of recognition from the art-loving monarch than the unjust letter wherein Alexis was reproved for the innocent utterances of the *Vossische Zeitung.*[1]

Far more widespread approval was earned by Berthold Auerbach's volume, *Village Stories of the Black Forest*, which powerfully furthered the realistic impulse, the democratic philosophy, of the new generation, and thus secured a place in the history of the day. Auerbach sprang from one of those Jewish and half Jewish villages which (rare exceptions upon German soil) are found here and there along the upper waters of the Neckar. His mind was formed by the study of Spinoza; as poet he had tried his prentice hand upon purely Jewish materials; now, with a sudden stride, he emerged from the

[1] See vol. VI, p. 548.

ghetto into German folk-life. His stories were neatly limned with all the diligence of the Dutch painters, and with scrupulous fidelity to nature. Fresh and vigorous, free from sentimental colouring, they were so realistically drafted that even the language exhibited incessant alterations, the Swabian dialect used by his peasants in their talk, and likewise in their letters, contrasting crudely and often unpleasantly with the High German of the narrative and of the copiously, too copiously, interspersed reflections. Auerbach had sent his manuscript to Bassermann's liberal publishing house in Mannheim, a firm to which Carl Mathy now belonged. Mathy's wife was the first to turn over the pages, and was entranced by the discovery of this new treasure of German imaginative literature. Freiligrath, too, ever unenviously appreciative of another's merits, exclaimed with enthusiasm: "This is a real book! I can't tell you how profoundly it has moved me." For the brothers Grimm, the wealth of upland locutions, sedulously transcribed fresh from the mouths of the peasants, was a welcome contribution to their treasury of linguistic lore.

The first success of the *Village Stories* was as great as it was well deserved. Satiated with the sugary drawing-room novels of the almanacs, readers turned with much satisfaction to this ruder fare, and for a time the blasé members of high society found Tolpatsch "original," Ivo "piquant," and Vefele "delightful." In this circle the young poet was looked upon as a merry drawing-room Tyrolese. He was a brilliant raconteur, spoke with astonishing frankness of his literary plans, and eagerly accepted every tribute. A loyal comrade and a warm-hearted liberal patriot, he made many friends, and even his Spinozism, with its strongly Jewish tinge, seemed, in accordance with the opinion of the day, not unduly divergent from the dominant Christian enlightenment. Numerous imitators hastened to turn to account this newly discovered world of village life, such writing becoming a shallow fashion. From all the obscurer corners of Germany, from Upper Silesia, and from the Ries district, there emerged during the ensuing decade a whole race of Tölpels and Rüpels. The cruder the behaviour of these peasants, the more loudly were they acclaimed as figures drawn from the life, the keener was the interest they aroused alike materially and ethnographically. There was doubtless an educative force in these simple topics, whose details could be scrutinised by every reader, for one who

ventured into this field of authorship had perforce to be true to nature. When the village stories came into vogue, imaginative writers aiming at higher things were compelled to be accurate and thoughtful in the observation of real life, which German poesy has been wont to ignore.

After the charm of novelty had evaporated, it became apparent, indeed, that even Auerbach's characters lacked the veracity derivable from an author's personal experience. Though Auerbach made deliberate use of far more finished artistic materials than did Immermann, the former never produced any figure so memorable as that of the village mayor in *Münchhausen*. He was fond of levelling jests at the theorising artists who boil an egg hard and then wish to hatch it out. Yet in truth he himself had but little original imaginative force. He often behaved like a scholar or a cultured dealer in antiquities, bringing magnificent specimens from his collection, and thoughtfully enlarging upon the peculiarities of these remarkable samples of the human race. Individual peasants among his figures, closely scrutinised, were after all nothing more than dressed up Jews, for where the obscure emotional life of the folk is being described, the voice of nature can never be wholly replaced by the adroit manipulations of the artist. This was first perceived in the poet's homeland, where connoisseurs of beauty abound. To the Würtemberg Swabians, Auerbach, however cordial his feelings towards them, never became so dear as Hebel became to the Badenese, for Hebel, though not aiming at artistry, had lived among Christians as a Christian pastor. Moreover, the feeling again became general that if great passion is to secure artistic grandeur of expression, a wide background is indispensable. In the narrows of village life, tragical struggles are apt to produce painful and crushing impressions, for behind them there lowers the hideous prose of the penitentiary, or of gross maltreatment. By degrees, too, the recognition gained ground that the much-admired children of nature among the common people, hampered as they are by rigid moral codes and notions of honour, are often enough less free and less humane in their sentiments than are persons of culture. It was realised that within the field of imaginative literature that place only can be allotted to the village story which Immermann had allotted to it from the first, the place of a modest episode. Solely in this small domain, which he had made peculiarly his own, did Auerbach

continue to display creative force. His attempts in other directions miscarried.

In the continually increasing crowd of authors, a certain number of women acquired renown. Conceived in the spirit of the democratic enlightenment was the work of Fanny Lewald, a liberally cultured East Prussian Jewess. She excelled rather in clarity of thought than in imagination, and was therefore more competent as critic and observer than in the domain of artistic creation; but she was possessed of wide sympathies, was honestly eager to promote the spiritual and economic uplifting of her sex, and was an estimable woman of good standing. At times only did she display a mode of sensibility utterly incomprehensible to the German temperament, as when she quite unconcernedly related how during the retreat of the French from Moscow her much revered father purchased from the unhappy fugitives the church vessels they had stolen in Russia, to put them in his melting pot. In *Jenny*, a novel with a purpose, she advocated the emancipation of her co-religionists, and did so with considerable ability, although with a tendency to make the most of the sufferings of the Jews. She possessed indeed the talent, the dangerous gift, which makes men of Hebrew stock such clever advocates, the faculty for seeing everything from one side only. Her freethinking Jewish heroine, baptised but still a freethinker, became engaged to a Protestant theologian; when the engagement was broken off this step was morally indispensable, was fortunate for both parties, and was nowise a proof of Christian intolerance. When this same wealthy Jewess uttered the touching lament, "Sweet fatherland, my fatherland, could I but be reunited with you, were it only in death," Christian Germans were not responsible for her sufferings, and offered no obstacle to her return to Palestine.

More delicate, more charming, endowed with more feminine amiability, was Fanny Lewald's deadly enemy, Countess Ida Hahn-Hahn, whose drawing-room novels were, however, loosely constructed and lacked finish. The attractive daughter of Count Carl Friedrich von Hahn-Hahn of Mecklenburg-Schwerin, well known for his theatrical ventures (for he devoted his whole life to and squandered a great fortune upon travelling companies), the countess had inherited eccentric and enthusiastic inclinations. Her "immense soul," ever dissatisfied, strained upwards towards "the right." It was her woman's

destiny that a temperamental craving for love should lead her, after many splendid wanderings, to make a pilgrimage at last "From Babylon to Jerusalem," and to find peace in the austerities of the cloister. Her world was the world of the nobles, not the vigorous noblemen dwelling on their paternal acres or fighting under the banner of their sovereigns, as described by Wilibald Alexis, but the elegant men of the world in the capitals and the spas, brilliant, gallant, busied in the study of profound feminine types, and so utterly unconcerned with the prose of life, that she could say of one of her heroes, typically enough: "The whole of yesterday evening slipped through his hands as if it had been money." From many of her love scenes there breathed a pure sentiment of sweet womanly immolation, but in the end all the doings of these well-dressed persons left the impression of aimless and futile idleness. Pitilessly handled by the critics, the countess' novels had almost the effect of satires; increasing the hatred felt for the nobility by the democrats of the younger generation.

High above these two oft-mentioned opponents stood Annette Droste-Hülshoff, who, though she is still comparatively unknown, was the most talented of all the women writers of Germany, but unfortunately lacked the power of artistic finish. She was born on the family estate of Hülshoff near Münster, among the taciturn, blond, dreamy-eyed Lower Saxons, to whom the gift of second sight is ascribed. Most of her life was spent in romantic solitude in the castle of Rüschhaus and other quiet residences on the moors of her homeland. Her last days were passed at the ancient castle of Meersburg on Lake Constance, where she stayed with her brother-in-law, Baron von Lassberg, last knight of the Holy Roman Empire, a man learned in saga.[1] She was one of those high-minded and distinguished women who inspire universal love and respect without ever awakening the passion of any man. Her strong, free spirit was quite exempt from conventual prudery. She was as little afraid of rude humour as of serious study or of the torment of doubt, and it was only after severe inward struggles that she returned to the Catholic outlook which had been impressed upon her mind from the cradle. She shared with her fellow-countryman Freiligrath a childlike delight in the great, the splendid, and the marvellous. Her poems and tales were thoroughly Westphalian, were vigorous children of

[1] See vol. IV, p. 551.

the red earth. Composed for the most part of simple materials, dealing with hill and moorland, with everyday life, with church festivals and domestic history, they were none the less illumined throughout with the passion and the power of an independent and elemental sensibility. To this daughter of the heath, the mysterious dream life of nature, whether in the country-side or in the fevered and storm-tossed soul of man, was from the first akin, whilst her virile command of language invariably enabled her to secure the fittest, the most impressive phrase even for the description of the supernatural. Unfortunately she was apt to mar the effect of her poems by their disjointed, nay, rough and incorrect, form. For her, as for almost all women, the secret of artistic composition remained elusive to the last. Annette stood far removed from the struggles of the day. Very rarely did she utter a word of warning against the premature efforts of those who imagined themselves able to remodel the world, or against the restless haste of the younger generation, which now seemed barely competent to appreciate to the full the joys and sorrows of a twenty-four hour day:

> Hope lies before and happiness behind,
> To-morrow steals the life from our to-day!

During these years the drama put forth fresher blossoms than did the other branches of poesy. Too long, already, had our theatre been blighted by the pedantic theories of the romanticists. Connoisseurs regaled themselves with Tieck's Shakespeare readings or with learned dramas unsuited for the boards. The despised stage, which after all has to live, which is forced to gratify the crowd's fondness for a spectacle, passed more and more under the sway of inefficient translators.[1] Such being the state of affairs, Laube and Gutzkow, the two ablest talents of Young Germany, did yeoman's service when they endeavoured to provide for the German theatre original German works which should be fitted for stage performance without being trivial. In France alone could they find exemplars, for the French nation was the only one whose theatre was at this time really alive. Fortunately, however, there was not in France any dramatist of outstanding genius whom German playwrights could servilely imitate as our historical

[1] See vol. V, p. 552.

novelists were imitating Walter Scott. Much, doubtless, could be learned from Scribe's finished technique, but his intricate plots were as uncongenial to the German temperament as were the characters in his plays, slight, conventional, irresponsible puppets. The need was for dramas in which the action should be no less tense and exciting than in Scribe's plays, but in which this action should be the necessary issue of the mutual impact of the characters. How difficult was the task. How great was the advantage bestowed upon France by her purely national stage. Her actors had only to represent Frenchmen, whose behaviour, good or bad, was intelligible to every member of the audience. Our poets and translators, in their cosmopolitan zeal, had ranged so widely over the world that they set German actors almost impossible tasks, and made the creation of a national dramatic style impossible. We lacked a metropolis; we lacked national feelings common to the whole German race; we even lacked vivid historical memories, for in Bavaria Old Fritz or the heroes of the War of Liberation were almost as unknown as the medieval emperors were unknown in Pomerania.

Laube's healthy, robust, practical nature enabled him ere long to shake off the Young German preciosity with which he was at first affected, though never more than superficially. He conscientiously secured a first-hand acquaintance with the theatrical world, a thing which for many years no serious dramatist except Immermann had regarded as essential. Associating on intimate terms with actors, he was glad to dedicate his pieces to them. He did not fail to notice that audience and players alike were still almost exclusively interested in dramas of middle-class life. By the use of materials comprehensible to all and lying close to everyone's hand, by sketching in bold outline, and by simple methods of exposition, he hoped to modify the degraded taste of the public and to win his audiences to the appreciation of dramatic masterpieces. His plays were somewhat laboriously put together, for he was devoid of lofty poetic inspiration, but they were well constructed and vivid, were animated with a boldness and a freshness which betrayed the merry huntsman. Never profound, they yet had meaning enough to please a cultured audience. His two most admired dramas, *Gottsched and Gellert* and *The Karlsschüler* (the Pupils of the Stuttgart Academy), owed their success, it is true, to an æsthetic defect which was only to

become plain to a subsequent and a more active generation. Searching for popular historical material, he esteemed himself fortunate in the discovery of Schiller, a man better known to all Germans than any of the heroes of political life, failing to recognise that purely intellectual greatness is inadequate as the theme of dramatic action. There resulted the production of a literary drama, a hybrid form agreeable to the sentiments of this age of transition, but with less justification for its existence than Platen's dramatic satires which had not been written for the stage. The history of literature in this case merely served the dramatist as a crutch, as an inartistic means for the production of cheap effects. The youthful Schiller, freeing himself from the clutches of the Karlsschule, delighted the audience, not through the force of the dramatic action, but because to everyone it had been familiar knowledge from school days that the young man on the stage was predestined to write *Wallenstein* and *Wilhelm Tell.*

Gutzkow brought more genius and more disquiet into the world of the drama. He, too, had long outgrown the aberrations of his youth, and, being a keen observer, had made himself thoroughly familiar with theatrical life. It was his ambition that his dramas should serve as weapons in the struggle of enlightenment against falsehood, whereas Laube, when introducing purpose into his plays, did so only as a means of attraction. Yet those of Gutzkow's dramas were the most successful wherein purpose was quite inconspicuous. For his sceptical understanding, the subtle points of comedy had more kinship than had tragical pathos. In *The Prototype of Tartufe,* employing all the apparatus of surprise which skilful construction for the stage is so well able to furnish, he brilliantly depicted the lot of the comic poet, whose praises all sing as long as they do not feel themselves to be a mark for his shafts. In *Pigtail and Sword,* writing no less vividly and laying the colours on thickly, he displayed the contrast between Old Prussian martial roughness and the refinement of modern universal culture. In this patriotic drama there was even to be heard at times a kindly tone of ardent love for his Berlinese home. The roughly limned figure of Frederick William I stood forth so clearly as to arouse in Prussian hearts a sentiment of humorous content. Even the dramatic censorship of Berlin, for all its timidity, was constrained at length to recognise that the traditional narrow-minded rule by which

the presentation on the boards of leading personalities of the royal house was forbidden, was injurious to the monarchical cause. When the great Hohenzollerns figured on the stage, they were made far more comprehensible to the populace than by statues or by paintings.

Gutzkow's tragedies, on the other hand, showed one and all that the nervous, restless, uneasily meditative poet had not yet attained internal freedom. *Richard Savage* deals with a matter of profound interest, the conflict between natural instincts and social hypocrisy, but amid the abundance of brilliant incidents and sparkling conversations, this main topic is treated with such triviality that the moral significance of the fable is completely lost. In *Patkul*, the abstract rhetoric on the art of liberty, and in *Wullenweber*, newspaper catchwords, took the place of tragical passion. A hasty writer, he did not allow himself time for the detailed development of his characters, though this was the quality he had especially admired in Schiller's work, and he therefore was unable to believe in the figures of his own creation as firmly as Schiller had believed in Max or in Tell. Even more uncertain, perhaps, was his moral touch in *Uriel Acosta*, the much admired tragedy of free investigation. The hero was not a thinker but a doubter, not a believer but a weakling, who was only saved from a shameful recantation by the concatenation of circumstances, instead of by his own deliberate resolve. But in those days of the free congregations and of German Catholicism, the verse "Conviction is man's honour" had a quite irresistible sound. Since the piece, in a number of effective scenes, figured the struggle of free thought against petrified dogma, the audience could easily forget what a pitiful figure was that of the hero. Although the potent forces of Jewry expressed their displeasure with the poet because he had chosen rabbis as embodiments of dogmatic intolerance instead of the customary Christian priests, the play remained a favourite with enlightened free-thinkers; and for many years after its publication the religious reaction was wont to signalise its victories, wherever they might be secured, by prohibiting the performance of *Uriel Acosta*.

All defects notwithstanding, there was a revival of the German drama, which was no longer content with the leavings from foreign tables. The younger playwrights regained faith in the future of our own stage. The pieces of Gutzkow and Laube unquestionably reflected the life of the day more faith-

fully than did the far more ornate dramas of Halm, the Austrian writer, who, quite ungerman in his methods and modelling himself upon Spanish examples, was able to make his unnatural and artificial figures tolerable only by technical adroitness and by the sonorous melody of his language. Apart from the Viennese comic dramatists, the needs of everyday consumption were supplied by Benedix of Leipzig, a merry wight, extremely resourceful in the presentation of broadly humorous situations. A few months before the outbreak of the revolution, in the first of Kalisch's more noteworthy farces, the popular figure of Zwickauer made his debut upon the Berlin stage. Now began the most flourishing period of the Berlin farce, which, favoured by the new freedom of speech, by the political excitement, and by the irresistible democratisation of manners and customs, was to endure for some fifteen years. All the humorous figures of lower class life in Berlin, which had hitherto been conspicuous only in Glassbrenner's broadsheets, now trod the boards. Pert, droll, and self-satisfied, they were not devoid of a coarse good-humour, and were never weary of poking fun at one another. Bold satire swept pitilessly over the heights and the depths of social life. The comic effect was enhanced by light music and cheeky couplets, and it was certainly a good thing that this capital city, over wise in its own conceit, should have learned once more to laugh heartily at its own follies. It is true that Berlin farce, a natural outgrowth from the sands of the Marks, remained essentially prosaic. The wind blew so cuttingly on the Spree that it withered the romantic blossoms which had in earlier days graced the farces of Raimund.

The reawakening creative impulse of the dramatists exercised an invigorating influence upon the histrionic art. Several of the theatres were distinguished by the excellence of their performances. The Dresden stage, ably managed for a time by Eduard Devrient, possessed two incomparable heroes and heroines in Emil Devrient and Marie Baier-Bürck for the drama, and Tichatschek and Wilhelmine Schröder-Devrient for the opera. At Dresden, too, the youthful Richard Wagner was already at work in the orchestra. Obtaining his first great success with *Rienzi*, he had already conceived the design of outbidding opera with musical tragedies, wherein music and verse were to be perfectly welded, and whereby the splendid and massive effects denied to the spoken drama could be secured.

A peculiar position, half within and half without his time, was acquired, by Friedrich Hebbel of Dithmarschen, a serious and thoughtful northlander who in the rough school of life had acquired a gloomy, almost hopeless, outlook upon mankind, upon the contradictions of modern society, and upon the history of Germany. He set before himself the most exalted aims, endeavouring always to furnish a dramatic setting for the great problems of ethics, and he gave expression to the realistic trend of his epoch by the inexorably strict and logical delineation of his characters and by the avoidance of all phrase-making. But his writing was too self-conscious; his dramatis personæ were too deeply concerned with their own peculiarities; every word they uttered was so closely calculated that they lacked naïve freedom and forfeited the charm of spontaneity. Although the concise composition, the vigorous action rising to an effective climax, and the shattering dénouement, seemed at first sight to guarantee a great dramatic success, he had not that sense for what is generally understood which is essential to all effective stage presentation. Morbid and involved spiritual struggles, strange to the degree of monstrosity, which he loved to describe, could not fail to estrange the simple folk among his audience. His first drama, *Judith*, had a confusing and mystifying effect. Hebbel had realised with clear insight that this epic heroine, who inspired feelings of straightforward admiration among the ancients, since their racial feelings were unalloyed, could not fail to appear a tragical figure to us moderns because to our free Christian consciousness the blind self-sacrifice of the individual to the community no longer seems an unconditional duty. The author therefore aroused in the dread woman's soul a storm of conflicting sentiments, amid which the nervous impressionability of the age became at last so conspicuous that a purely tragical compassion with the heroic figure could no longer be excited.

His most effective drama was *Maria Magdalena*, a tragedy of middle-class life which strongly recalls *Cabal and Love* in its vigorous tension and in the force of its passion. But even here the reader's or onlooker's impressions are confused, because the heroine's fault was so unnaturally, so singularly conceived. Subsequently Hebbel withdrew in disappointment from all contact with the stage, choosing a deliberate isolation such as is always disastrous to the playwright. Surrounded by a troop of fanatical admirers who fanned the flames of

his conceit, he brooded long over a new and impossible artistic form, the tragi-comedy. Not until many years had been spent in distressing struggles did he recover faith in simpler ideals and regain power for the production of works of permanent value. Hebbel was a highly endowed poet and a profound thinker, a true son of our age, with its aspirations towards the heights and its comparative paucity of achievement.

One only among the newer dramatists, the Silesian, Gustav Freytag, possessed the spontaneous joyfulness of the happily creative poet. Eagerly as he might throw himself into all the intellectual and political struggles of these days of agitation, he never failed to preserve that "comfortable limitation of outlook of one in love with reality" which Goethe was so fond of indicating as the true happiness of the poet. He was fond of his characters and lived among them; he seemed to take them to his heart so that they became ever memorable to himself and to his audience, whilst the dramatic figures created by the other playwrights of the day are so often marred by calculation, by reflection. Herein lay the charm of his first drama, *The Wedding Journey*. The scenes, though loosely strung together, delighted the reader because the hero's sunny humour illuminated everything, and because the cheerfulness of our sixteenth century was agreeable to all. Freytag recognised that this piece was not an acting play, and after a careful study of the conditions of stage production he produced two plays depicting modern society, *Valentine* and *Count Waldemar*. Both dealt with the same simple but beautiful and weighty problem, showing how true love is competent to woo a noble nature back to moral freedom from the perversions of society life. He took considerable liberties, as was possible to one who wrote so fascinatingly, but never descended to sensationalism. His dramas were closely knit, but even more effective were the characters, which were such intimate associates of the writer's own mentality, and had been matured in the quiet recesses of his mind. No less effective was his free optimistic humour, which enabled him to discern the human elements even in a guttersnipe.

Growing to manhood on the frontier, in close contact with the slavs, he was a proud Prussian, a genuine man of the Mark, convinced of the superiority of the Germans. At the university he devoted himself to Teutonist studies, and his mood remained so fundamentally German that the cosmo-

politan enthusiasms of those days could not fail to repel him. Doubtless he was glad to learn from English romances and French dramas, but the materials for his own pieces were inevitably drawn from the fatherland alone. Here was his world, and he was rarely troubled by the desire even to visit a foreign land. America, which upon the narrow canvases of the village stories was always made to appear as the Eldorado of freedom, sometimes played a part in his poems, but only when he had occasion to detach one of his heroes from the German still life of these years of peace by a romantic breath of adventure. On principle he would have nothing to do with dramas with a purpose, for such purpose, he declared, should never find expression in his own works of art. He was fortunate in possessing journalistic ability. Since he was able, as critic and publicist, to express his literary and political ideas in suitable form, the barque of his poesy could run freely before the wind unfreighted by prosaic ballast. His first dramas, though the dramatis personæ moved in the higher circles of society, manifested definitely enough the writer's bourgeois democratic sentiments. Simple moral truth was represented by the bourgeois characters, whereas the seamy side of the nobility was alone displayed. Freytag was as yet but half way through his development. His heroes still played wantonly with life, without controlling it by their actions. The day was yet to come when Freytag was to be the favourite writer of the cultured German bourgeoisie.

He was strikingly distinguished from his fellow dramatists by the dignity of his simple, pure, and moving language. One who read these dramas, one who read the poems of Geibel and Dingelstedt, one who read the prose of the brothers Grimm, of Ranke, of Dahlmann, and of Schelling, could not but recognise with delight that the fresh vital energy of the youngest and most plastic of the tongues of civilisation had suffered no serious injury either from the purifying mania of the Teutonists or from the cosmopolitan ornamental gardening of the Young Germans. All the writers that have just been named wrote excellent German, each after his own manner, and our strength lay in this freedom of individual style. The taut strings of the glorious old golden harp still gave forth a splendid tone, for the instrument had merely tarried the coming of the master.

§ 3. THE FINE ARTS.

Imaginative literature is ever the preeminently national art. Just as a language is fully understood only by the people to whom it truly belongs, so does the imaginative writer create the ideals for his purposive activities out of the very life of his own nation; all the great Christian peoples, much as they may have owed to the interchange of ideas with foreigners, have created their classical poesy mainly from their independent energies. They have done this in very varying phases of development, many at periods when surrounding nations were lying fallow; but in every case this has been achieved by a nation when its own soul had become free and rich. Temperament is national, whereas eye and ear are citizens of the world. The great epochs of music and the plastic arts, Gothic, Renaissance, baroque, and modern architecture, despite the multiplicity of national styles, are common to all civilised nations. From the community of manners and dress, of intercourse and world relationships, every century fashioned for itself definite tone sensibilities and types of form to which each individual nation was more or less subject. This cosmopolitan trend of the plastic arts was manifest even in the nineteenth century, which, restlessly seeking and hastily creating, has never been able to discover its own proper style. The sublime idealism which had first awakened among the German painters in Rome could not fail to exercise an influence on French art; but two decades later, so speedily that the artistic styles of this unquiet period seem almost as fugitive as fashions, the reaction from the French side had clearly begun.

Cornelius and his pupils cherished an aristocratic pride which could not be permanently sustained in this democratic century. They looked upon art as a world of ideals totally severed from the common life of every day, as a temple which no one could enter with unhallowed feet, nor without thoughtful preparation. Just as in their own creative work they thought little of technique in comparison with artistic originality, so did they regard themselves as vastly superior to the craftsmanship of the artist's trade, whereas in epochs that are truly animated with a delight in beauty, art exercises a universal influence, lighting up the life of every household with the

embellishment of the objects of daily use. In France, craftsmanship had never fallen into such utter decay as in impoverished Germany, and it was not by chance that the former country was the first in which painters resumed the attempts to copy nature faithfully in every line and to delight the eye with the charm of colour. In the literature of all countries, likewise, this realistic impulse, in conformity with the fundamental tone of the new age, secured powerful expression, the only difference being that imaginative writers, following their respective national peculiarities, gave expression to the impulse in very varying forms. In painting, on the other hand, the French colourists served as models for direct imitation. The Düsseldorf school of painting, the first to venture a timid resistance to Cornelian idealism, learned much from France, whilst the Belgians owed the French even more. At the same period, when Belgium freed itself from the political domination of Holland, the plastic arts began to revive on the Scheldt. Since this bilingual people could never produce a national poesy, since Hendrik Conscience, the Flemish novelist, wrote only for Flemings, the Belgians, in splendid rivalry, producing richly tinted canvases, fostered and practised painting as the national art, which was to justify before Europe the country's newly won independence, to justify it in the field of the spiritual life. In the year 1843 two really fine historical pictures, one by Gallait and the other by de Biefve, made the round of German towns, arousing everywhere intense admiration, the general comment being that German artists should imitate these Belgians in their vigorous use of colour and in a characterisation that was so true to nature. At the same period the Germans became more closely acquainted with the work of Paul Delaroche, the greatest of the neofrench painters, through being enabled to see his lively picture of Napoleon at Fontainebleau. German connoisseurs, who were still affected with the aloofness and rigidity of the old idealism, engaged in serious disputes upon the question whether it was æsthetically permissible that this Cæsar, shown seated after his long flight, exhausted and despairing, should have real mud upon his riding boots. Unprejudiced beholders, however, were grateful to the foreign artist for bringing the great and the terrible into such close human proximity. Men's outlook was beginning to change; they demanded sensuous truth, natural energy, vivid potentiality; and they felt affronted

when presented with some formless embodiment of the artistic idea.

Thus unfavourable were the auspices when Cornelius came to tread the hostile soil of Berlin. For Munich his departure was an irremediable loss. The angry Wittelsbacher might defiantly declare, "I, I the king, am art in Munich," but it soon became apparent that the great painter's masterful personality had alone held the artist community together. One after another notable painters deserted the town on the Isar. Disunion and dissatisfaction were rife, and it was long before Munich artists were able to some extent to regain the consciousness of a great historical mission which Cornelius had awakened in them. But the master himself was to suffer painful disillusionment, although upon his departure he had proudly declaimed to his opponents:

> I hasten hence upon the hippogriff.
> Milk you your cow! I grudge you not the pleasure.

The first work upon which he embarked in his new surroundings was Christ in Limbo, abominably painted in oils. The Berliners, who were not accustomed to monumental painting, and had so recently been filled with enthusiasm for the new Belgian colourists, were repelled by it. Now, younger artists under Cornelius' direction painted Schinkel's frescoes in the atrium of the museum, and even unprejudiced persons found it impossible to deny the weaknesses of this school of art, however turgid it might be with ideas and theoretical programs. The symbolical pictures of the energies of the world arising out of chaos and of Hellenic culture straining upward towards the light of heaven were disfigured by bad drawing and false colouring. What trace was there here of the self-denying artistic industry which had animated the impetuous Michelangelo when patiently, and with his own hands, he painted the mighty roof of the Sistine chapel? This thoughtful work could only arouse true pleasure when at eventide, under festal illumination, the great field of colour loomed fantastically among the high columns, and when the defects of the individual figures became inconspicuous in the uncertain light. Meanwhile Cornelius was designing the cartoons for the never completed Campo Santo, and he put his detractors to shame by training himself with the indefatigable energy of youth, until he gained a greater

and ever greater mastery of form. Never before had his genius revealed itself with so much power as in the elemental and overwhelming dreadfulness of the Apocalyptic riders or in the majesty of the angel of wrath surmounting the ruins of Babel.

The old band of his faithful admirers in Rome and in Munich uttered joyful acclamations whenever he showed them a fragment of his great work. In Berlin opinions were still divided. In truth the master, when every hope that he would be able to complete his designs had vanished, gave himself up at last to a sublime artistic idea which, extravagantly original, was peculiarly his own. From the store of his personal feelings, he created an epic with interspersed choric songs, a work which boldly transcended all the traditional limitations of artistic form. His warm admirers Rauch and Rietschel were agreed in insisting that he ought not to have the fine groups of the beatitudes carried out in colour, but as reliefs in white marble. Both these great sculptors were well aware that relief requires the utmost rigidity of plastic form, and must renounce all the charm of colour. Cornelius was thus solitary in a transformed world. He had ever regarded with contempt the public "which eats chaff and pineapple with the same relish." To one of the new colourists he said bluntly: "You have fully succeeded in doing something which I have spent my whole life carefully endeavouring to avoid." He had been the friend of two kings, and it was without prejudice, unquestionably not to flatter, that he introduced the portraits of the Prussian royal family into his painting The Expectation of the Last Judgment. The anointed of the Lord were to lead human life until the last of all the kings should surrender his crown into the hands of the crucified. He could conceive of no other outlook, and the democratic ideas which were now flooding the world remained utterly incomprehensible to him.

Far more readily did Kaulbach make himself at home in the new time. This man of many gifts was summoned to Berlin shortly before the revolution to paint for the staircase of the new museum some gigantic pictures dealing with the history of mankind. His skill enabled him to revive the declining taste for the colossal style, and for fully ten years, throwing Cornelius quite into the shade, he remained the Berliners' favourite artist. The impartial profundity of the painters of the old Italian historical school, who had endeavoured

to represent the spirit of the past as simply typified in the great deeds of great men, was too straightforward for the taste of the king of Prussia, a man of such multifarious reading. In his view, the content of historic life was to be discerned, not in will or in activity, but in the idea. He loved to immerse himself in historico-philosophical speculations which, little as he realised the fact, were in truth derived from the much-abused Hegel. It was in accordance with these notions that Kaulbach was to represent in great symbolical pictures the ideas of which history was the expression. The two first and the finest of this comprehensive cycle, The Battle of the Huns and The Destruction of Babylon, displayed the circumscribed unity of dramatic action, but the other pictures in the series presented no more than a confused medley of remarkable incidents, of which the observer might make anything he pleased. They were manifestations of an erudite art, no less Alexandrian in its characteristics than was the unhappy edifice of the new museum itself. Only with the aid of scientific commentaries could they be fully understood. But none the less they were more comprehensible to the average man than were Cornelius' cartoons, for no one who contemplated Kaulbach's pictures could feel oppressed by the overwhelming weight of religious enthusiasm. They breathed a modern liberal spirit, the spirit of the enlightenment which, emotionally no less than intellectually cool, felt competent with equal facility to deal with the figures of antiquity, the middle ages, and the renaissance, a spirit which was able to find direct satisfaction for the modern impulse towards liberty even in the depiction of the nations making their joyful exodus from the stronghold of Babel.

Kaulbach was especially happy in his treatment of such sublime allegorical figures as were shown in isolation, like that of Saga. His historical groups, on the other hand, devoid as they were of personal life, and merely representing ideas, tended to become so routinist in character that every creation of Kaulbach's muse can be forthwith recognised by the compressed and simpering mouth, recalling a section mark lying on its side. Yet everything was painted in a dashing, vigorous, and effective style; the artist's fertility seemed inexhaustible; the delicate tints of water glass painting (stereochromy) were more agreeable to modern tastes than the crudity of fresco. The wealth of recondite allusions in these historico-philosophical

paintings furnished abundant material for the hyper-cultured chatter which is accounted brilliant on the Spree. The Berliner was delighted at his own cleverness when he was able to discover a great idea in the impossible group of the Christians peacefully fleeing from burning Jerusalem, or when in the Shakespeare forming one of the figures in the picture of the reformation epoch he could recognise the face of a noted art critic.

Many traits in Kaulbach's character recalled that of Heine or Voltaire. He was doubtless far superior to the German poet in the transcendent power of his plastic imagination; but he was by no means the Frenchman's equal, for whereas Voltaire embodied the national culture of a whole well-stored century, Kaulbach represented no more than the fugitive manifestations of our liberal enlightenment. But he remained ever full of mischief, the illustrator of *Reynard the Fox*, knowing and despising mankind. During these very years, when all the world was admiring his ideal historical pictures, his talent was still most strongly and characteristically displayed in small and impudent humorous sketches making mock of the sensuality and the folly of the world—sketches which in many cases had considerable difficulty in escaping the paternal attentions of the police des mœurs. Unfortunately, this satirical impulse was not invariably kept within bounds. When King Louis commissioned him to furnish paintings for the outer walls of the new Pinakothek, Kaulbach could not resist the temptation of making cruel fun of all the modern art of Munich, to which he owed his own training. He thus outraged both artistic and moral sensibilities by the tastelessness of his colossal caricatures.

Cornelius observed with growing aversion the whole modernist career of this renegade disciple; and he could not but be profoundly mortified that monumental painting, which he had ever declared the preeminently German art, should during all these years have secured but one highly gifted devotee. This was Alfred Rethel of Rhineland. Quite independently, taught rather by Dürer and Holbein than by any modern master, Rethel had trained himself to become a historical painter in the grand style, and in his cartoons illustrating the history of Charlemagne, displaying no less profundity of insight than Cornelius, but without any symbolical trappings, he allowed the men and the weapons to speak their

own simple language. With equal vividness he could depict the majesty of tranquil manly beauty and the satanic allurements of sin. Nothing but the express command of the king enabled him to execute these splendid pictures in the town hall of Aix-la-Chapelle. To such a pitch of frenzy had religious hatred been increased since the Cologne episcopal dispute, that the municipal council of the old Carlovingian town, having given the commission to Rethel, subsequently wished to withdraw it, because the artist, a native of the ancient "realm of Aix," happened to be a Protestant, though no one could have suspected the fact from his pictures.

Meanwhile Julius Schnorr von Carolsfeld, one of Cornelius' most faithful pupils, had left Munich after the completion of his cycle of Nibelung pictures. It had been his chief happiness in the Bavarian capital when King Louis, ever eager to see completed works, had occasionally allowed him to depart from the wonted methods of the notorious "hasty art" of Munich, and had granted him time for the finished performance of his grandly conceived designs. Since, after his return to his Saxon homeland, he had no further commissions for monumental painting, he was able to devote himself to an undertaking he had long since begun, the production of his *Bible Pictures*, the only work of the Cornelian school to acquire popular favour, the only one to bring this ultra-aristocratic artistic method within the comprehension of the masses. Interpenetrated with the Schillerian idea of promoting the æsthetic education of the human race, he purposed to make sacred history manifest to the eyes of the people in fresh and vigorous lineaments. He looked upon the woodcut as a miniature fresco, as an artistic form which permitted the draughtsman to present action in bold outline. After the manner of the old Italian painters, despising the realism of writers of picturesque travel, he gave to his holy figures, both in vesture and visage, the ideal "old world" character which enabled them to appear, not as Semites, but as the bearers of universal sensibilities. There was thus produced, in the course of many years, a real people's book, simultaneously sublime and generally comprehensible, unmistakably Protestant, and yet conceived after the German fashion in the spirit of universal Christianity, the most splendid inheritance which the old idealistic art, in the very days of its decline, bequeathed to our middle classes.

Schwind, who ever remained faithful to his old master,

being an inspired musician, was well aware that it is only possible to sing in the manner permitted by nature's gifts, and he therefore formed a classical and romanticist picture world of his own out of the German folk tales and sagas. Friedrich Preller of Weimar, too, the youngest of Goethe's pupils, was the declared enemy of the new realistic French art, which works from without inwards, whereas the true German must work from within outwards. He, likewise, followed his own path. Ideal landscape was his delight, and he always treated his subject as a whole, producing his effect by the composition and by the general flow of the lines. At the same time he had the faculty of limning the naked human form with a simple classical power which was rivalled only by his friend, the great draughtsman, Genelli. When he travelled in southern Italy, retracing the wanderings of Odysseus, Preller's imagination spontaneously peopled rocks, woods, and seas with the images of the Homeric heroes. Only in the solemn grandeur of these natural surroundings could he call up their figures before his mind's eye, and it was now that he planned what was to be his life work, the cycle of the sublime Odyssean landscapes.

Even the quiet life of the Düsseldorfers was not wholly unaffected by the struggles of the time. How quickly had Wilhelm Schadow succumbed to the spirit of religious faction. An amiable man to begin with and a teacher full of sympathetic understanding, he had smoothed the path for many persons of the most varied talents. But now priestly intolerance was poisoning the whole of life upon the Rhine. Since the valiant Carl Friedrich Lessing continued undismayed to glorify the heroes of the reformation in vigorous historical pictures, vivid and ardent but never deliberately partisan, distressing discord inevitably arose in the Company of the Düsseldorf Paint-Box. The neonazarenes gathered round the standard of Schadow, among them Deger and many another gifted artist, who displayed feeling and technical ability in the frescoes of the church of St. Apollinaris at Remagen. Yet in all their works can be traced the one-sidedness of a sectarianism which has never been congenial to the free German temperament; and the newly founded Düsseldorf Union for the Diffusion of Religious Pictures aimed on principle at favouring a Catholic art incomprehensible to heretics. Notwithstanding all their quarrels, the lively Düsseldorfers did not forfeit their sense of fun, as is witnessed by Hasenclever's broadly humorous

pictures of the wine tasters. Ultimately, the inevitable disputes in the Düsseldorf school proved advantageous by preserving its members from petrifaction. Independent studios now became established in addition to Schadow's academy, and in these a new generation gradually attained to maturity. There were genre painters able at length to paint something besides the plump and pious girls of Old Düsseldorf; there were landscape painters able to depict something newer than the same old moon shining across the same old hills bordering the Rhine. These artists of the new school took delight in the colourist energies and in the vivid characterisation of their Belgian and French neighbours. Art students no longer blindly accepted Genelli's dictum: "The fish belongs to the water, the artist to Rome." Lessing himself had never set foot upon the soil of Italy. People were beginning to realise that through prolonged and intimate association the artistic forms of the south had been incorporated into the flesh and blood of every cultured German painter. They perceived that it was now possible to create an independent northern art.

Meanwhile a modest master who for long had been almost unnoticed showed that even in this epoch priding itself upon culture popular art could secure great results with simple means Ludwig Richter had grown to maturity amid the quiet self-satisfied philistinism of one of the poorer suburbs of Dresden, in a world of petty-bourgeois types. A simply pious and contented youth, his spirit was little affected by the narrowness of his surroundings. Nature was so rich and gentle in the cheerful valley of the Elbe, and he could enjoy such splendid dreams beneath the branches of the old pear tree in the garden amid the profusion of roses. In Rome, subsequently, he was on friendly terms with Koch and with his fellow-countryman Schnorr, and in this strict school he made essays upon historical landscape in the grand style. Being compelled, however, on one occasion to improvise a picture at short notice, almost involuntarily he sketched a crowd of Saxon peasants, men, women, and children, wending their way churchward on a Sunday through a field of lofty corn. It was the voice of his heart speaking, the foreshadowing of his life's work.

Returning to his frugal and happy home, he speedily became aware that for him, the burgher's child, the German landscape had a far more intimate message than had the proud princess of the south, and he realised why the Latin if he

lie in a wood lies on his face, whilst the German lies on his back. The petty life of his domestic environment became more and more dear to him, and he now began to sketch for wood-engraving, a genuinely German art which in Dürer's days had influenced our nation far more profoundly than had painting. Long forgotten, it had at length been revived in England, and quite recently had secured many adepts in Germany as well. Unsophisticated as ever, Richter turned from the great to the small, from the sublime to the simple, without an inkling of the fact that this change was partly conditioned by the changing mood of the time. Art in his view was "an angel of transcendent beauty leading human beings, when these are good hearted, into sun-kissed and flower-spangled spaces." In countless repetitions, and with enduring delight, he depicted the doings of his countrymen: students and handicraftsmen, the house made of gingerbread in the folk-tale, the children nipped with cold who stand in the cake market in Dresden selling chimney-sweeps fashioned from prunes. But his favourite subject was family happiness—the Christmas tree, the punch-bowl of new year's eve, and the steaming dish of potatoes—matters within everyone's experience.

His work was characterised throughout by happiness and peace, and it displayed in addition a flavour of the cordial Spenerian pietism which still persisted among the devout inhabitants of Electoral Saxony. No one could have discovered from his drawings that Richter had been brought up as a Roman Catholic, and that not until he had attained manhood had he made acquaintance with the unfalsified Bible, an acquaintanceship which brought him fervent delight. He was invariably successful in his portrayal of the quaint common folk of his immediate environment; his drawings of women and children, of angels and gnomes, were likewise all that could be desired; he was less happy in dealing with men of action, and the figures of our heroic poetry were beyond his powers of depiction. He paid little attention to costume, but was fond of placing his figures in the centre of a smiling landscape, or of drawing a house in an enclosure, with smoke rising from the chimney and standing out against the dark background of a fir wood. Appreciation of his work soon became general. During the fifties, Richter's woodcuts were to be found upon well-nigh every German table; learned æstheticists

wrote monographs upon his development; collectors fought to secure the drawings he had made for a book of drinking songs, a people's calendar, or a collection of folk-tales. He thus passed his days untouched by hatred or envy, universally beloved; and even when advanced in years he would walk daily, with a lively step, meditating upon God, up to the forest margin overlooking the vine-clad hills surrounding Loschwitz, to enjoy the charming view. He never realised that during his very life-time the artistic taste of this restless century had changed once more. The generation that delighted in Richter's pious simplicity was rich in literary and political ideas, but still extremely simple in its habits. Subsequently, as wellbeing increased, larger claims were made on life, there was a more vigorous impulse towards a sensuous fullness of existence, and those who lived in this transformed epoch began to find innocent and friendly idealism tedious and futile. There was a manifest decline in the pleasure taken in Richter's woodcuts. It may be that the taste for such works has vanished for ever, for in the capricious changes of fashion of an age of satiety, whilst elegant works of art like Watteau's long-despised paintings may come again into their own, the easily contented persons who idolised the Dresden draughtsman's pictures of children are not likely to be met with again.

Concerning the idealistic beginnings of our new painting, Schnorr said on one occasion: "We had quite enough to do at that time when we were endeavouring to learn once more how to work in accordance with the fundamental principles of the great fifteenth century masters. It was impossible for us to do everything at once, and we felt entitled to leave the subsequent steps to our successors, and entitled above all to leave to them the development of technique in the same spirit." But all art is the hand's cunning, and the artist can never venture to look upon technique as a subordinate or unessential matter. Our painting needed an artist who should seek the truth and nothing but the truth, should seek it with hand and with heart, should be inexorably in earnest, should pursue his quest more vigorously than the Düsseldorfers had done, and who should at the same time be so great a master in the field of creative imagination that no one could venture to despise him as a mere handicraftsman. As pioneer of strong and virile realism, there now suddenly appeared Adolf Menzel, a Silesian, who since early youth, appreciated by but few, had

been struggling hard for a living in Berlin. He knew nothing of Italy, and among contemporary German masters not one had exercised much influence upon him, not even Franz Krüger, the painter of Prussian soldiers. He took a perfectly independent line, looking keenly around him into the real world, saying tranquilly to the enthusiasts for beauty: "If you expect nothing, you will have many agreeable surprises."

When the *History of Frederick the Great* by Franz Kugler, the historian of art, was published in 1839 with illustrations by Menzel, German science might well cast down its eyes with shame. Since the days of Archenholz, author of *A History of the Seven Years' War*, no notable historian had ventured to deal with this abundant material. Kugler's text was no more than a cheerful and somewhat pedestrian narrative. But the woodcuts were irresistible in their rendering of the very essence of a great age. Battles and court festivals, heroic wrath and heroic distress, destruction and the joy of victory, the whole of the king's strenuous development from the stormy days of youth down to the close of the sixth year of the war when as a bold warrior he still stood upon the edge of the abyss, his life on into the last gloomy years of solitary grandeur—everything was displayed with such convincing truth that Alexis' patriotic novels were quite put into the shade. The work seemed to burst upon the world of a sudden, and no loyal Prussian who immersed himself in it could fail to ask involuntarily why it had not been produced before. No other nation possessed such a book of national memories, which in its modest form was accessible to all, and which was none the less as rich in profound historic content as the great historical canvases of the Old Netherlanders (the doelenstukken and regentenstukken). How colossal, too, was the industry requisite for the elaboration of these little drawings. Careful study had been made to ascertain the precise distance between the buttons on the uniforms, the length of the metal mountings on the officers' canes was measured to an inch, and the details were subsequently reproduced with vivid artistry. Menzel knew that all true history is full of crude colour; he did not hesitate to follow the provost-marshal through his harsh daily work, and depicted him cutting the switches for the next morning's punishment.

Four years later began the preparations for the Berlin academy's édition de luxe of the works of Frederick the Great,

and it was taken as a matter of course that to Menzel must be entrusted the commission for the two hundred vignettes. But the monarch was obviously ill at ease concerning the realism and the pugnacious energy of these Frederician pictures. He never had a personal interview with the draughtsman, nor even examined any preliminary sketches, fond though he was of dabbling in art as a rule. During the six years in which Menzel was engaged upon this task, the only instruction he received from the court was to the effect that none of the vignettes were to exceed twelve centimetres in height.[1] He was consequently enabled, like our sixteenth century masters, to utilise to the utmost the happy freedom of the woodcutter's art, and, like them, he could unfold all the wealth of his inventive fancy. In this form of portrayal, almost unrestricted in its scope, there was no occasion to fear what is the ever-imminent danger for consistent realism, an overstepping of the proper limitation of art. Moreover, the wood-engravers, Unzelmann, Vogel, and Müller, were already such finished masters of their technique that they were able to follow the artist in the boldest of his flights. His illustrations to Frederick's philosophical essays showed clearly enough that he was far more akin in spirit to the royal freethinker than to the great king's romanticist successor on the throne. Feminine charm and gentle meditativeness offered no attractions to him; his domain was the thought and the action of men. The materials with which he had to deal necessarily led him to immerse himself in the worlds of the baroque and the rococo styles. This accorded with his spontaneous inclinations, and when as frontispiece to the *History of Frederick the Great* he chose a picture of Schlüter's equestrian statue of the Great Elector, with the old palace in the background, he was giving simultaneous expression to an æsthetic and to a historical idea. Moreover, his drawings restored once more to honour the prolific minor arts of a period that has been far too stringently criticised.

These men of strong, proud, thoroughly individual nature have little inclination to found a school, but Menzel's influence, though indirect, unostentatiously exercised, and slowly manifested, was stupendous. When he subsequently opened the series of his great paintings with the Round Table of Sans-Souci, and when later still, returning to the subjects of his

[1] Personal information from A. Menzel.

earliest works, he dealt with the life of the immediate present, it became impossible to ignore his pictures. Every artist was compelled to regard his own image in this pitiless mirror, and to ask whether he too was being true to himself. Consequently there dawned a new age for German painting, an age rich in successes, but as time passed rich too in aberrations. Thoroughly German alike in his subjects and in his mode of treatment, Menzel was far more fortunate than had been any of the idealists in winning admiration in foreign lands, for the impulse towards being true to life to which he gave so powerful an expression dominated the feelings of the entire epoch.

The year which witnessed the publication of Menzel's *Frederick the Great* witnessed also a momentous development in the sculptor's art. For two generations the plans for a memorial to the great king had been debated in Berlin. Tassaert and Schadow, Schinkel and Rauch, had vied one with the other in proposals, and the multiplicity of these plans gives a faithful reflection of the varying artistic sensibilities of a questing century. When Rauch was at length commissioned to carry out the undertaking, he at once recognised that Frederick's proud sincerity was even less suited to classical pomp than had been the simple greatness of the commanders in the War of Liberation. The figure of Old Fritz was still a vivid memory. To place that figure upon a Trajan's column, in a temple, or as the triumphal occupant of a quadriga, as even Schinkel had suggested, would have been a grave offence to popular sentiment. Now Rauch was no less firmly convinced of the popular significance of art than was his favourite Rietschel, who wrote encouragingly to the master that a work of art acquired its true authority through being understood by the people, through elevating the people, through inspiring the people with enthusiasm. Upon Rauch's proposal, the late king had six months before his death approved the erection of an equestrian statue, this being the last great service performed by the unpretentious but ever thoughtful Mæcenas of German art. His successor took up the idea whole-heartedly, but agreed to an enlargement of the design. On the socle of the monument the entire heroic cycle of the Frederician age was to be represented in splendid bronzes, and the king endeavoured to help the sculptor in the composition. Artists, professors, and officers were all asked for advice as to the

names of those worthy of a place upon the socle. The tedious discussions positively came to resemble a historical family council of the Prussian nation. Manifest was the power of a great era in history extending its influence down into the present. It was a point of pride with all the great warrior stocks that their forebears should find a place upon the national monument.

The intelligent features of Frederick the Great, a delight to the painter, offered grave difficulties to the sculptor, for the main force of the king's expression lay in the penetrating eyes, whilst his profile presented only two clear-cut lines. For these reasons, Rauch was compelled to portray the king with a hat on, just as the Hellenes had hidden the bullet head of Pericles beneath a helmet. Thus the only vestige that remained of the earlier suggestions modelled upon the antique was the heavy coronation mantle draped round the ruler's shoulders, and harmonising ill with the three-cornered cocked hat, the crutch-stick, and the uniform. The sculpture on the socle conformed strictly to the dress of the period. The mounted figures of the king's chief army leaders projected from the four corners. Three of the sides were occupied by the crowd of generals, whilst on the back were the statesmen and thinkers. What a demand to make of this grey-headed artist, who had just been delighting in the serene beauty of his Walhalla Victories, to ask him now to present in their hideous dress "all these people furnished by the hairdresser with precisely the same number of ringlets above their ears." No wonder that he at times felt "on the verge of mental collapse." But with iron will he persisted in his titanic task. For the heads he had to depend for the most part upon bad likenesses, but he was none the less competent to convey to each the idea of a vigorous personal life. The figures, some quite free, some in half relief, and some barely outlined on the socle, were so cleverly arranged that the excess of arms and of legs was concealed, whilst the tranquil group of the men of peace formed an effective contrast to the more animated figures of the warriors. The work did not attain the majesty of Schlüter's statue of the great elector, and the excessive altitude of the superstructure gave it a somewhat stiff appearance. But German sculpture had not hitherto during this century produced so magnificent a creation. Unfortunately the monument could not be unveiled until after the revolution, when the

Prussians were out of humour with their unhappy king, and would tender him no thanks.

Ernst Rietschel, the disciple whom Rauch loved, followed in the master's footsteps, aspiring towards a more sharply characterised and realistic method of expression, without abandoning classic severity of form. Gentle, pious, and modest, Rietschel resembled in many respects his friend and fellow-countryman Ludwig Richter. But his spirit was less trammelled, his endowments were greater, and he had been steeled in a hard school. In the extreme poverty of his early youth the boy had turned his gaze with eager anticipation from the mountains of Lusatia towards the distant pinnacles of Dresden. When at length he gained the goal of his desire and reached the city of brilliance and the arts, misfortune dogged his footsteps for years, for he was perplexed, without proper guidance, sitting under incapable teachers, in a soft romanticist atmosphere, positively overwhelmed at times by the thought that the sculptor has to create for eternity—until Rauch at length disclosed to him a new world of energetic beauty. His first decisive success was now secured when in his Pietà he gave an entirely new and characteristic rendering of the theme which others before him had treated a thousand times, working with sensibilities as keen as those of the old masters of Nuremberg, but displaying an incomparably purer sense of form.

Next the Brunswickers commissioned him to execute their statue of Lessing, and here his experience was necessarily the same as that of Rauch in connection with the monument to Frederick the Great. It was impossible for the deadly enemy of the affected Latinism of French tragedy to be draped in a toga, for the contemner of all specious appearances to be figured in a theatrical mantle. Rietschel therefore decided to venture upon going a step further than the master, and he represented Lessing, as Schadow had represented Zieten, vigorously, simply, and truthfully, without any ornamental trappings, in the dress of his own time, thus giving a fine example of defiant German realism. In essence Schadow's Zieten had been nothing more than an academic figure which happened by chance to be clad in a hussar's uniform, but Rietschel succeeded in securing complete harmony between the form and the content of his statue of Lessing. In every detail he made a virtue of necessity, utilising the bag-wig for the display of the flowing hair, whilst the tightness of the short breeches enabled him to

indicate the vigorous lines of the lower limbs. This work, too, requiring much thought and taking long to execute, was not completed until after the storms of the revolution. Thus the sculptor's art began to make its way towards the summits of a classically trained realism, but a realism not estranged from ideals. The future was to show that upon this steep peak there were many alluring divergent paths, leading downward to the crudities of naturalism and to artistic disorder.

Among the architects of this epoch, one only, Gottfried Semper, was a man of genius, and strangely enough King Frederick William never attempted to win Semper to his service. Semper remained in Dresden, and after the fine semicircular theatre, richly adorned with sculpture by Rietschel and Hähnel, had been completed, he began the building of the new museum, a work which luminously outshone all the architectural undertakings of the art-loving king of Prussia. It seemed rash to the verge of madness, this design to fill in the fourth side of the Zwinger square with a Roman renaissance palace, and yet the pure and tranquil beauty of the elongated structure, recalling the work of Bramante, was happily set in its picturesque environment, contrasting vigorously with the overladen splendour of the rococo pavilion. The cheerful and cordial grace of the interior appealed to everyone who entered the finest gallery of the north. This edifice, and the well-merited admiration it evoked when it was completed after long delays, proved how irresistibly this animated generation was aspiring to advance beyond the classical simplicity of Schinkel's days.

§ 4. HISTORIANS AND POLITICAL THEORISTS.

The fresh political breeze which had been blowing through the German universities since the expulsion of the seven of Göttingen went on increasing year by year during this age of impatient expectation, with the natural result that professors were now more prone than they had ever been before to participate in the struggles of the day with the weapons of science. Just as Fichte had formerly desired to use philosophy for the domination of the life of action, so in like manner, and with the same emotional conviction of a lofty moral mission, had Dahlmann ever conceived the function of his politico-historical teaching office. He wished to make facts disclose "how, as

a matter of practical experience, the tasks of statecraft have been more or less successfully fulfilled," and thus to suggest to his hearers the path for their own activities. At the request of his friends he now resolved to issue in book form two courses of his lectures, dealing respectively with the English and with the French revolution. With extreme conciseness, recalling that of Mignet, in pithy and moving language and with marvellous power in the delineation of character, he described the two great upheavals. Mignet, indeed, had been fortunate in that he was narrating the history of his own fatherland, so that the Frenchman's work, even after it had been refuted from the scientific outlook, could count on a continual vogue among his compatriots as a memorial of the national glory. So hard, however, was still the lot of German historians that Dahlmann was never able to devote himself to writing the history of the nation upon which all his thoughts were centred, and his portrayal of the two foreign revolutions, his demonstration of which for his own people was designed to enable them to pluck the tart fruit of self-knowledge, could only continue to arouse the interest of the Germans while they still believed that foreign nations ought to serve them for examples. But for this brief period, perhaps for ten years, the two books exercised a strong and wholesome influence. They were the stormy petrels of the German revolution.

For the first time in his life this serious-minded man, chary of words, succeeded in delighting the broad masses of the cultured middle class. In countless motions and speeches in the diets during the next decade, Dahlmann's winged words were reechoed. Just as in the previous century the ladies of the Parisian salons had thoughtlessly played with the ideas of Voltaire and Rousseau which were soon to destroy the old French society in devastating flames, so now Dahlmann's works on the revolution were eagerly read, not merely by the liberal princess of Prussia, but also at ultra-conservative German courts. With deeper earnestness both books enunciated the "porro unum est necessarium," the demand that Prussia should make the indispensable change to constitutionalist institutions. "Steadfastly," he wrote in plain terms, "does the great overseer of the universe continue to insist upon the performance of this task." Although Dahlmann, being quite free from Schlosser's moralising narrowness, was able, with genial humour, to appreciate an opponent's outlook, he nevertheless expressed

his political ideas with such powerful emphasis that doubters could not but feel shamed and discouraged.

The strength of the two volumes is found precisely in the deliberate one-sidedness of their fundamental ideas, for one who, when great patriotic struggles are in progress, is able to maintain a perfectly dispassionate poise of mind does not deserve to enjoy such moving experiences. Niebuhr's *Lectures upon the Age of Revolution*, which was issued from the press almost simultaneously with the works of Dahlmann, left readers cold, for it breathed the almost vanished mood of the years of restoration, whereas Dahlmann heralded what the present was stormily demanding. Yet in Dahlmann's books there were plenty of undefended points, points open to the attack of professional scholars. Whilst the historian can never attempt to do more than deal with a section from the multiplicity of happenings, in this case the limits were most arbitrarily fixed; foreign policy and social conditions were kept quite in the background; the two revolutions were presented merely as struggles concerning constitutional questions. The author had undertaken little independent research, borrowing freely, now from Guizot, now from Droz. An undue meed of admiration was allotted to the champions of constitutional monarchy; to Hampden was assigned the position which properly belongs to the protector Cromwell alone; Mirabeau was placed upon an eminence to which the elemental force of his genius may perhaps entitle him, but which he had certainly no right to occupy as a reward for his political activities. Yet, despite these defects, the enormous influence exercised by both writings showed how much more important are political thought and political will than erudite research. They said the right word at the right moment. They compelled even the pusillanimous historians of Germany to refrain henceforward from timidly hiding the light of their political judgment under a bushel. For several years their valiant author became the most respected political leader of our professorial world. Like a prophecy resounded his utterance: "Unlimited monarchy has had days that can never be forgotten; but now, since it is no longer sustained by the faith of the nations, it moves upon its course making a vain clamour, like the clacking spokes of a wheel whose hub is broken."

Yet more incisively and boldly did J. G. Droysen voice the demands of the day in his *History of the Struggle for*

Freedom. Reared in a quiet Pomeranian parsonage, Droysen had early entered the most highly cultured artistic and intellectual circles of Berlin. Exercising his many endowments in the translation of Æschylus and Aristophanes, he next wrote a *History of Alexander the Great,* a work characterised by a fine youthful enthusiasm, in which, after the Hegelian manner, he was for the most part unjust to the weaker parties. By the term "struggle for freedom" he understood the whole of the great movement which had shaken the civilised world from the days of the rebellion of the North American colonies to those of the peace of Paris. The book could be no more, and indeed made no endeavour to be anything more, than a first attempt to awaken among Germans a consciousness of the spiritual meaning of this teeming time. The treatment of facts was necessarily defective, seeing that the German archives had not yet been opened. The narrative was greatly outbalanced by the reflections, and history was given the aspect rather of a dialectical process than of a struggle between conflicting individual wills. But the ultimate goal of the long developmental process was clearly and vividly displayed, so that the reader could discern how nationalist Prussia, outgrowing its separatist spirit, was destined ever more and more to merge itself in the wider Germany. The entire programme of moderate liberalism was more exhaustively demonstrated than in any other book of this epoch, a programme whose items comprised: national independence and unity; legal security based upon fundamental laws; a genuine citizenship founded upon local governmental and parliamentary freedom; due autonomy in all spheres of life which are independent of the supreme ends of the state. For Droysen, who had not completely freed himself from the trammels of the doctrines of the rights of man, the sovereign freedom of the moral human being was comprised in the sum total of these demands, which constituted, in accordance with Schön's familiar saying, the indestructible buttress of every throne. King Frederick William had by this time become so completely obsessed by his ideas of representation by estates, that he could not tolerate even these measured and finely enunciated conceptions. He accepted the first volume of the book with frigid thanks, but returned the second to the author with an ungracious message.[1]

Dahlmann and Droysen were well within the rights of the

[1] Personal information from J. G. Droysen.

historian in their endeavour to win from a knowledge of past experiences light for the guidance of the present. But side by side with this justified aim, there now became manifest an unwarranted tendency towards malicious allusions and masked hints, an evil practice totally incompatible with the dignity of history. David Friedrich Strauss, having made an unhappy marriage with the beautiful singer Agnese Schebest, had in a mood of profound depression been quite inactive of late years. Even now, freed at length from conjugal fetters, he had not fully recovered when, once more seizing his pugnacious pen, he poured forth his long repressed anger against King Frederick William in the pamphlet *The Romanticist upon the Throne of the Cæsars.* The best feature of the writing was its witty title, which sufficed, though the work was little read, to secure for it permanent renown in newspapers and books. The Emperor Julian, the great military commander, the serious and prosaically minded statesman whose thoughts were wholly occupied with political cares, was here compared with the romanticist king of Prussia, because the grave Roman had endeavoured to reestablish the old religion, a religion that had been inseparably intertwined with the Roman state, and because Christianity, in Strauss' opinion, was now as completely outworn as paganism had been in the days of Julian. None but eyes blinded by hatred could draw such a comparison between men fundamentally different alike in their merits and their defects, and the author's dull jests concerning the romanticist "cathedral building" of the temple of Jerusalem, or concerning Julian's strictly religious cabinet orders, served only to heighten the repellent impression of banality.

A few years after the revolution, Otto Abel, the Bonn historian, used the whip of satire more brilliantly and more effectively than his fellow-countryman Strauss, choosing as hero of his parable Theodatus, king of the Ostrogoths, a learned weakling, whose cowardly dread of action led to the destruction of the glorious realm inherited from great forefathers. Abel's writing was free from the malice of partisan hatred. Filled with profound patriotic distress, he did not disturb the course of his narrative with a single word of innuendo. Even to-day when a calmer posterity has long since been enabled to recognise that such historical comparisons can never be more than half truths, the work can be read with frank pleasure as a little masterpiece of historical characterisation. What Strauss had

ephemerally hinted in an ill-natured capriccio, was cumbrously elaborated by Adolf Schmidt, the Berlinese historian, with all the diffuseness of learned pedantry. His *History of Freedom of Thought and Freedom of Belief during the First Century of Imperial Rule and of Christianity* discussed "the relationship of monarchy to the effects of the enlightenment, monarchy and public worship in league against freedom of belief," and contained a mass of like ponderous hints. Frederick William and Tiberius, Eichhorn and Sejanus, were displayed as kindred souls. The lame comparisons, the spiteful jibes and home-thrusts, utterly distorted the picture of the past, but even this venomous book found many admirers in an age disordered by the spirit of faction.

It was a severe blow to the self-esteem of these constitutionalist scholars that the greatest of German historians should have contemplated their efforts with almost the same aloofness as had been displayed by Erasmus towards the campaigns of Luther. Ranke enjoyed the personal friendship of Frederick William, and regarded the new regime with confident hope. Shunning every bias, and liberal bias above all, with marvellous fertility he now completed his *German History in the Age of the Reformation*, from the scientific outlook the most valuable of the works he had hitherto published. The Germans of Ranke's day knew astonishingly little of the most momentous century of the German past. The writers of the enlightenment had paid little attention to the era of the reformation, or else, like King Frederick, they had degraded it to the level of the commonplace. Schiller, who with the instinct of genius instantly recognised the unique grandeur of that epoch, was able merely to sketch the days of Luther in casual though brilliant remarks, because there was such a lack of materials for the composition of his two historical works. Subsequently the history of our sixteenth century was left almost entirely to the theological writers of religious history, who, after their manner, represented the movement that transformed the world as a struggle between dogmatic systems. Ranke was the first to write the political history of this epoch, basing his work upon the proceedings of the diets and upon many other discoveries in the archives. With such certainty of vision did he discern the decisive men and the determinative events amid the process of phenomena, that he was able to say with well-grounded satisfaction: "Later discoveries may perhaps

throw further light upon matters of detail, but can serve only to confirm my fundamental conclusions."

Throughout the general reading public the usual opinion was the one current no less among the children of the enlightenment than among the Jesuits, the view that greed for the possessions of the church had chiefly determined the policy of the German princes. A new world was opened, with the disclosure of the intimate vascular network of diplomatic proceedings, and with the detailed demonstration of the manner in which the political and the religious oppositions had now determined one another, now clashed. Almost more surprising than the abundance of fresh information was the independent judgment which promptly assigned to their proper place in history facts which had long been known but had hitherto been misunderstood. Who, before Ranke, had ever noticed that the real schism in the church, that the formation of independent territorial churches within the empire, was at the outset the work of those who held the old faith, and that the Protestants had merely followed the momentous example of their opponents? Here, too, Ranke always kept his gaze fixed on universal history, but since in Luther's day the religious movement which dominated the western world originated in Germany, "originated, indeed, in the true and pure depths and in the inborn power of the German spirit," he was at his ease on this occasion in confining himself to the affairs of the fatherland. He was fain to admit that this new work lacked the artistic finish of the *History of the Popes*, for of all historical materials, German history, preeminent in its profundity, is no less preeminent in its uncouth complexity. Moreover, the author's aristocratic temperament made him feel more at home among the refined courts of Italy than in the full-blooded, coarsely humorous folk-life of our sixteenth century, virile to the pitch of obscenity. Mass movements were uncongenial to him, and he was not wholly just to the rationality underlying the savage social passions of the peasants' war.

He would sometimes say: "I would willingly surrender my own individuality if I could but come to see things exactly as they happened." Dull disciples, men without any individuality to lose, eagerly spread the saying abroad, as if it could serve to cloak their own nakedness, when, in fact, it merely gave drastic expression to the master's intense longing for the truth. Beyond question he had no thought of main-

taining in all seriousness that either the physically impossible or the morally reprehensible can be a scientific ideal. In the *History of the Reformation* his individuality was far from being surrendered. His ardent and intense Protestant conviction was sustained throughout; and although Luther, the stout old conservative, was obviously dearer to him than were the radical heaven-stormers of the early Wittenberg days, none the less he sketched the moral grandeur of the German reformers with so adequate a comprehension that the ultramontanes have ever since regarded him as a dangerous enemy. To Ranke, as to his royal friend, a simple ascending progression of human development seemed incompatible with the justice of God, and although he was willing to admit that the unsearchable creative force of history brings into being noble and ignoble nations, highly gifted and lowly gifted generations, and consequently produces epochs that are grand and epochs that are petty, it yet remained a delight to him to discover a ray of the divine reason in every age. This characteristically pious conviction gave an atmosphere of tranquil wisdom to all his works.

It seemed almost incredible to foreigners that a German professor should undertake to pass political judgments upon an era which had hitherto been the exclusive province of the theologians. But at home this book was the first to secure for Ranke the position which, as far as world literature was concerned, he had already attained through the *History of the Popes.* Not even yet, indeed, was admiration universal. When a book which one person only could have written makes its appearance, the envy of mean souls wells up on every side. In countries where an old-established national pride exists, such pettiness is curbed by the national instinct, which leads people to refuse to be robbed of so unique an individual. In Germany this obstacle to envy had as yet no place. With philosophical self-complacency the critics of the *Deutsche Jahrbücher* looked down upon Ranke's "half thoughts," lecturing him condescendingly upon historical facts of whose existence they had first been informed by the reading of Ranke's own book. Even men of wider culture did not escape the faction spirit of liberalism, and in the circles of Humboldt and Varnhagen, F. von Raumer, and even Preuss, the laborious and inoffensive collector of facts, were given a far higher place than was assigned to the author of the *History of the Reformation.*

Unfavourable judgments were voiced even more boldly

when the *Nine Books of Prussian History* made its appearance in the years 1847-1848. Stenzel, intimately acquainted with the life of the Germano-Slav frontier, had been the first to attempt the presentation of Prussian history from the earliest times, in a manner that should be generally comprehensible and in a spirit of moderate liberalism. Ranke now confined his attention to one of the most important sections in the history of the Prussian state, to the period when the absolute monarchy, having first reconstituted the state from within, raised Prussia to the rank of a great power by the two first Silesian wars. Once more the author furnished students of history with a new outlook. To the delight of his royal patron he demonstrated that Frederick William I had been the creative organiser of our administration, and predicted how great a treasure of political illumination would be forthcoming when the history of the Prussian administration should in due course be portrayed in its full sequence, and as the result of a detailed study of all the official documents. This judgment harmonised with the opinion of Schön, who had ever considered gratitude and respect due to the restorer of Lithuania, but liberal opinion was not so readily to be dispossessed of the traditional caricature of the rude, uncultured "primitive man," Frederick William. In any case, in a period when the general urge was in the direction of constitutionalist forms, little appreciation could be expected for the great days of royal absolutism. The book aroused little interest. The elegant, coldly diplomatic narrative, skating swiftly over the thin ice where Frederick I's foreign policy and similar matters were concerned, contrasted too glaringly with the realism of Menzel's drawings. At first, therefore, the *Nine Books* secured a thankless reception. In its case, even more than in the case of most of Ranke's writings, years had to elapse before his new ideas could be fully understood by the nation.

It was the current delusion that Ranke's pacific spirit need be encountered with no more powerful weapon than contemptuous mockery. The overwhelming hatred of liberal public opinion was reserved for Stahl, professor of law, a man of rigidly conservative views, and the only leading political intelligence among thinkers of Jewish blood. A people which had lost its national state in the remote past could not but remain estranged from the living sense of the state. Even Spinoza's two political writings owed their reputation to their

great argumentative energy, and not to political insight. But Stahl had become so wholly the Christian and the Prussian that his fellow-tribesmen soon ceased to account him one of themselves. Quite independently he had versed himself in the historical school of law. In his *Philosophy of Law Historically Considered* he began by refuting the dead abstractions of the doctrine of natural law, and gave a convincing demonstration that nowhere can there exist anything but positive law, law that is a historic growth. Having thus routed his opponents, he undertook to erect a system of politics and law "upon the foundation of Christian philosophy"; but here his keen and profound intelligence lost itself in the byways of that fanciful Schellingian method in accordance with which the thinker, as soon as he had unplifted himself to "the idea of the universum," claimed the right of elucidating the highest problems without proof, and simply through the contemplation of the aforesaid idea. Stahl recognised that all law acquires its content from the national consciousness, that its prestige is intrinsic; but he perceived that its ultimate ground must rest upon the command of the living personal God who dominates the personal life of history, just as the conscience of nations and of individuals, which expresses itself so divergently at varying times and in different places, none the less furnishes a conception common to all, of a highest moral good, of the will of God. Unfortunately, however, he believed himself to know more of this ethic, of this divine command, than is permitted to mortal man; to the state, which is humanly determined, he ascribed a divine character, imagining himself able to discern in the fortunes of the state the indirect influence of the divine will, for he conceived that, as a universal rule, even the definite individual embodiments of state authority participate in divine consecration. He thus strayed into the domain of the unprovable, and in the exposition of fundamental political ideas, he frequently presented nothing more than arbitrary subjective opinions in place of scientific propositions, advancing these opinions, it is true, with all the emphasis of an intimately experienced religious conviction.

Yet how grossly was he misunderstood when he was consequently stigmatised as a mystic. Just as in former days, when he was a Bavarian deputy, he had stoutly defended the rights of the diet, so throughout life did he remain the declared enemy of all coups d'état and of all arbitrary police measures.

Thoroughly modern in outlook, he attacked with equal vigour the theocratic ideas of Adam Müller and the feudalist political doctrines of Haller, and he definitely declared that the inner vital impulse of the age was manifested universally in the endeavour to replace the particularism of the estates by national unity, and to substitute a constitutionalist for a patrimonial political philosophy. Though he rejected the dream of a state ideal, he regarded constitutional monarchy as the most significant of the existing forms of state, provided only it were Christian. The leading sections of his work *The Christian State* dealt exclusively with constitutional monarchy, for his practical and realist mind was wholly occupied with the struggles of the present. Erudite researches into the constitutional form of earlier days had no charm for him, and his slender store of historical knowledge would have been inadequate for any such task. His conception of the Christian state was broad and liberal. He had no desire for a state church, demanding merely that in constitutional, legislative, and administrative matters the state should be guided by the principles of Christian verity; that the state should protect the churches, should acknowledge itself Christian in all its public activities, and should therefore, whilst according to nonchristians all other civic rights, withhold from them political rights and offices.

When the decisive hour in the Prussian constitutional struggle was approaching, Stahl published his masterly booklet *The Monarchical Principle* (1845). He here demanded the creation of a national assembly meeting at regular intervals, so that the crown might not be outdistanced by the march of events. At the same time, however, he demonstrated the limits imposed upon constitutionalist ideas as far as Germany was concerned by the country's monarchical history. Although in respect of certain details his judgment may have been unduly timid, he really did not deserve Dahlmann's mockery, for with more breadth of view even than his critic did he recognise the most dangerous errors of the dominant liberal doctrine, errors from which a subsequent generation was only to free itself after bitter experience. He pointed out the absurdity of the unrestricted right of resistance, and the impracticability of a general refusal of supply. He gave a convincing demonstration that Prussia's democratised society can neither endure the rule of a parliamentary majority nor dispense with the

personal will of the monarch, and only to-day are people beginning to understand clearly his utterances anent the danger of electoral methods based upon the simple counting of heads. His desire was for a Reichstag founded upon the representation of estates, a body which should incorporate all the great social contrasts of modern society, but which as a whole should represent the united nation and not the interests of the individual estates, and he was therefore justified in terming this monarchy of estates "constitutional." Among the systematic writers of the ultra-conservative parties Stahl occupied as unique a position as was occupied by Gentz among their publicists. As yet, however, people were not in the mood to do him justice. The very name of his book, *The Christian State*, sufficed to inflame the press against him, since the press was dominated by Jewish influences. Nor can it be denied that his judgment of domestic religious questions was ever far more unprejudiced than were his views on political matters. As the outcome, doubtless, of his Bavarian experiences, he demanded for the teaching caste of the Protestant church a power that was incompatible with Protestant freedom. Thus engaged in an incessant struggle against public opinion, and subsequently against the undisciplined excesses of the revolution, this man of moderate views, who in controversy was invariably courteous even to the most venomous among his opponents, was pushed further and further into the reactionary camp, until at length the contrast between legitimacy and revolution, between faith and unfaith, seemed to him to embody the sole content of the mutable process of human history—a devitalised abstraction, to which, in all its crudity, he would in younger days never have committed himself.

Widely sundered from this thinker was G. G. Gervinus, the youngest of the seven of Göttingen, whose writings exercised an almost more notable influence upon the liberal world than did Dahlmann's two books upon the revolution. Gervinus' early life had been passed in a mercantile career at Darmstadt. In Heidelberg, subsequently, powerfully affected by Schlosser's moralist treatment of history, he had with indefatigable industry devoted himself to scholarship. A man of comprehensive, many-sided, and yet unharmonious intelligence, morally earnest, but unamiable, capricious, and domineering, he was teeming with ideas while devoid of speculative profundity, an artist in his tastes but with no real appreciation of style, an enthu-

siastic patriot utterly lacking in talent for politics. Unselfish and free from petty social vanity, his attitude towards pliable and ingratiating young men was one of paternal benevolence, but persons of stronger nature, those with ideas of their own, found him somewhat overwhelming. He never became aware of these strange contradictions in his own character, for from the first his immoderate self-conceit was strengthened by two sentiments which are as a rule mutually exclusive, the pride of the self-taught man and the caste arrogance of the professor. Having early acquired renown through his bold attitude as one of the seven of Göttingen, and having subsequently spent many years in almost entire freedom from official cares, with no children, idolised by his charming wife, and spoiled by the friendship of older and greater men like Dahlmann and the brothers Grimm, he became more and more absorbed in his own sublime ego, until at last he was affected by a doctrinaire infallibility which in an epoch of world transformations had inevitably to be chastised by a tragical humiliation.

He had early cherished the ambition of fulfilling practical ends by the writing of scientific works, of stimulating the nation thereby to engage in moral and political activities. When he first designed the composition of a considerable treatise, he suggested to his publisher the alternatives of a history of modern times, a monograph on politics, and a history of literature. The publisher preferred the third of these alternatives, and thus originated the best of Gervinus' works, the *History of German Poesy*, a book of permanent value whereby the science of German literary history was first placed upon sure foundations. Heretofore Goethe alone, in *Poetry and Truth*, had given an accurate historical picture of the beginnings of our classical literature. Apart from this, the history of German poesy had been solely dealt with from the æstheticist's outlook, or in the enumerative fashion of the lexicographer. Even Schlosser had depicted the literary movement and the political struggles for power as proceeding simultaneously side by side but without mutual interaction. Gervinus was the first who endeavoured to elucidate this mutual interaction, to demonstrate the genealogical tree of our literary ideas, to grasp the growth of imaginative literature in its association with the destinies, the doings, and the sentiments of the nation, to understand it, that is to say, in its determinism. Thus walking in Goethe's footsteps, he indicated a trail which all his numerous successors

were compelled to follow more or less closely, and in addition he furnished a wholesome stimulus to investigators in kindred fields. At about the same time, Schnaase and Kugler, still pursuing their studies from a rigidly subjectivist outlook, undertook the delineation of the history of art as a whole. In the first elaboration of so vast a material, numerous errors were inevitable, and no less inevitable was it that this youthful science should prove two-edged even in its success ; for whereas in some there was awakened a reflective awareness of the æsthetic development of Germany, in others the new movement encouraged the fashionable and foolish fondness for encyclopædias, the tendency to talk at large about books which had never been read. Unfortunately Gervinus' pioneer work was marred by a barbarous uncouthness. The critic who hectored all German authors, Goethe not excepted, on account of their style, was himself unable to write German. Dishevelled, distraught, and gasping for breath, did the reader escape once more into the open after he had struggled through the thorny thicket of Gervinus' tortuous sentences. How intolerable, too, was the fault-finding tone which permeated the work. Carping criticism had long been the deadly sin of the North Germans, but they were now excelled at their own trade by this southern master.

His phenomenal capacity for railing and sparring had been displayed years before in the detestable booklet *Goethe's Correspondence.* When this was published, not long after the poet's death, Gervinus, then a young man of thirty, considered himself entitled to run atilt " against the extraordinary Goethe-mania of our day," although such a folly was confined to a very narrow circle. Speaking of the most straightforward man that had ever lived, Gervinus ventured to declare that Goethe's last writings and letters had merely been penned " to mystify the public," like the celebrated *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de France sous Napoléon, écrits à Ste-Hélène, sous sa dictée!* If our greatest poet were thus calumniated, what had the others to expect ? The only writer to receive cordial commendation was Lessing, who, as one of the heroes of the enlightenment, stood no less high in the good graces of Gervinus than in those of the latter's teacher, Schlosser. In the case of almost all the other poets, the author served up such a flux of exhortations and expositions that the reader's pleasure in the character studies, which were often brilliant and forceful,

was completely marred, while the author's bludgeonings continued through the decades and did not spare even the very latest poets. Such criticism inevitably palled. He could not permit any historical character to live out his own life in freedom. Gervinus always wanted to hear the sound of his own voice, demanded always dates from fig trees, ponderously explaining what the author under review should have done or should have become. To the chivalrous lust of battle that animates a Hutten or a Lessing, the reader can forgive anything, even where these champions were in the wrong, but Gervinus' pedantic superiority proved in the end yet more annoying than Schlosser's moral zealotry, for beneath the latter there could ever be discerned the beating of a kindly heart. Classical works enfranchise the soul; this is their sure touchstone; they lift the reader upwards, so that with clarified intelligence or with invigorated courage he can gaze around him into this beautiful world. Gervinus' book aroused anger and disgust; the example of his harsh judgments was injurious to a nation which was in any case slow to bestow due recognition upon men of talent. Young writers, joyfully creative, those who naturally constitute the receptive public for æsthetic and literary works, loathed Gervinus as a personal enemy, as a truculent wretch who wished to poison for them in the very womb the tender offspring of the muses. How differently did young Friedrich Vischer set to work in his *Æsthetics*, furnishing a truly productive criticism, and delighting above all the artists among his readers by new outlooks drawn from the living wealth of the universe.

Considered as a scientific work, the main fault of the *History of German Poesy* lay in the haphazard character of its historical judgments. Gervinus had as little tincture of philosophy as of religious faith, and yet he did not hesitate, his method contrasting in this respect with Ranke's sagacious reserve, to improvise a philosophy of history which severed the vital nerve of the historic world—individual freedom. He effected a simple deduction of historical laws from the observation of recurrent events (which after all could not really recur), from brilliantly conceived parallels, and from comparisons that were no more than partially valid. The most important of these laws, the one upon which the whole book was founded, was indubitably false. Gervinus contended that the blossoming times of religion, of literature, and of politics were successive

phases in the course of history, whereas it is an obvious fact that art and imaginative literature have independent lives of their own, lives which are doubtless influenced by political happenings, but are not thereby strictly determined. Each nation infallibly formulates its own æsthetic ideals, as soon as hearts and imaginations are set in motion by new and powerful ideas. To their unperturbed national development the English owed the enviable fortune whereby for them the days of greatest warlike renown were likewise the days of preeminent activity in the field of imaginative literature. The Germans and the Italians, on the other hand, completed their classical works of art amid grave political disasters. Other nations, again, were so much exhausted by great religious or political struggles that their literary energies were for a time paralysed. Finally, even though it was impossible for every epoch to achieve greatness, to all civilised nations both art and poesy have been no less indispensable than daily bread. Gervinus had no comprehension of this multiplicity of historical life, simultaneously free and subject to law. One of those who would forbid a silk-worm to spin, he roundly declared that German poesy had lost its vital energy since the classical days of Weimar. Such being his opinion, he treated with contemptuous injustice almost all the imaginative work that had been penned subsequently to the writings of Schiller and Goethe. A year or so after the publication of Immermann's *Münchhausen*, he termed the whole of our most recent belletristics a poisonous and stagnant swamp. He summed up the issue of his investigations in the words: "Our poesy has and its day, and if German life is to escape petrifaction, talent, now aimless, must be attracted towards the real world and towards the state, where new inspiration is to be poured into new matter." Thus extraordinary were the paradoxes that originated in this age of expectation. Whilst the poets of the time, singing to our people, were uttering warnings against singing, this learned professor wrote five volumes of historical and literary disquisitions to prove in the end that our old æsthetic ideals had ceased to possess significance to-day. In this unscientific manner did he reinforce the political trend of the young lyricists whom he so profoundly despised.

Speaking generally, his work was regarded as a political utterance, just as Schlosser, the moralist, was chiefly esteemed by the reading world as a preacher of the democratic hatred

of despots. Gervinus' historical ideas, despite much exaggeration and distortion, none the less served to convey the true and apposite thought that for the new generation political passion and political activity were more essential than æsthetic contemplation. Indefatigably applying this idea in every possible direction, he helped to educate our people on behalf of the national state. It is true that he completely lacked political foresight, and that of his numerous prophecies hardly any were fulfilled. The constitutional forms of the internal life of the state seemed more important to him than the great relationships of power in the society of nations, relationships to which Ranke preferred to devote his attention. In truth, Gervinus never got far beyond the outlook of the South German liberal parliamentarian. He therefore never considered it worth his while to make himself intimately acquainted with the two leading political factors of Germany's future, the Prussian state and the customs union, although he demanded for Prussia the hegemony of the Federation. But how could anyone expect to derive detailed and well-informed instruction from the innumerable observations interspersed throughout the *History of German Poesy*? A strong patriotic emotionalism sufficed him here. Ruthlessly, unceasingly, and ever fully convinced of the soundness of his own views, did he lay bare to the Germans the untenability of their political condition. But radical truths take deeper effect when uttered with moderation. If this man, a consistent opponent of Börne and the Young German radicals, found it necessary to give so glaring, so inexorable, a description of the shame of our disintegration, his readers must indeed have occasion to beat their breasts. Thus his book became a power in the political history of the day, a terror to all reactionaries, whilst in the development of German science it occupied a still higher position.

With the delicacy of an affectionate friend, but very plainly none the less, Jacob Grimm announced his objections to this "moral-political" severity, which would lead people to seek in our old fables of animal life a moral example or even satire, rather than the gentler epic touch. Least of all could Grimm forgive Gervinus for his injustice towards Goethe, who, said the philologist, "has sung in such a manner that had he never existed we should hardly be able to feel ourselves Germans." Grimm himself belonged to an earlier generation. During student days at Marburg he had never looked at a

newspaper. Subsequently he had been fired by the political enthusiasm of the War of Liberation, but directly the din of battle had subsided he had returned to his quiet work "for the advantaging of the people," to his peaceful and profound researches. Similar was still the life of the two brothers in their new sanctuary at Berlin. It was distasteful to them to receive adulation as political heroes on account of the affair of the seven of Göttingen, for they had merely obeyed the dictates of their consciences, had done no more than loyally keep oaths they had sworn. What spot was there on German soil where they would not have felt at home? To the end of their days these two men were characterised, not only by the energy of vigorous creative power, but by a simple directness, and by a glad thankfulness for every good that life could bring. It is true that they were not free from home-sickness for the red hills of their native Hesse, but immediately in front of their house rustled the foliage of the ancient trees in the Tiergarten. Wilhelm took a childlike pleasure in watching the goldfish swimming in the pond in the park. Rededicating to Bettina the folk-tales, which he improved with every edition, he expressed his appreciation that his old friend was still able to contemplate a posy of simple flowers with all the pleasure of early youth. In the case both of Jacob and Wilhelm was fulfilled what Jacob wrote to his nephew: "Those who are foolish and wild as students, are often tame and dull in after life; whereas for those who are zealous in their studies, energy and joy do not usually fail in later years." [1]

Shortly before the outbreak of the revolution, Jacob Grimm had completed the fourth of his great works, the *History of the German Language.* He here endeavoured to settle his account with comparative philology, a science of which he had been one of the founders, but which had in the interim undergone a vigorous independent growth. He discussed the relationships between the tongues of the ten primitive races which he assumed to have existed in Europe, and went on to consider the closer kinship among the Goths, the High Germans, the Low Germans, and the Scandinavians, writing of these, "the further we go back, the more similar do we find them to be, and they have a common origin." With intense earnestness, looking upon himself as the guardian of a national treasure, he indicated to his fellow-countrymen the important bearing of

[1] Jacob Grimm to Rudolf Grimm, November 18, 1848.

language upon the power of a nation. He showed how incomparable would to-day be the standing of the Teuton stock in history, if only the Goths, the Burgundians, the Franks, and the Lombards had preserved their mother tongue in the lands they had wrested from the Latins. The Germans, who had held fast to this treasure, had, through all the transformations and political strife they had experienced, never lost the sense of a common nationality, for had it been otherwise the neighbours of the Danubian Celts would not have received the name of Marcomanni. Unquestionably the sometime romanticist occasionally indulged in arbitrary flights of imagination. The remote primal age exercised so powerfully a fascination over his mind, that he prized the world conquests of the Teutonic migrants almost more than he valued all that the Germans had subsequently done in a settled political life. A pure flight of emotional fancy, too, was his unverifiable assumption that the Getæ of antiquity were Goths, but he could never take a view of the origins of the Teutonic world great and powerful enough to please his taste. At this time the brothers were engaged upon a new work, the great *German Dictionary*. The publication was undertaken by the excellent "Weidmänner," Solomon Hirzel and Carl Reimer, partners in the Weidmann book business in Leipzig, whose first aim in the undertaking was to help the expelled professors through the troubles of their years of unemployment. Before long more than eighty collaborators were engaged in collecting data for the work. That which in France had been brought to fruition solely by the Académie, under the protection, nay, the coercion, of the all-powerful state authority, was effected in Germany by the free activity of the learned world. The brothers sketched the design for their dictionary in a spirit of freedom very different from that which animated the French academy. It was far from their wish to cramp the German language by rigid rules; they desired to fortify it for a free life through self-knowledge.

Besides Jacob Grimm, the bold discoverer, Carl Lachmann, the keen critic, was at work in Berlin. A living bridge between Teutonist and classical philology, within a few decades he had trained the younger science in the stricter and securer methods which the elder science had learned to adopt only through the labour of centuries. There was a fine process of give and take. The classical philologists learned from the Teutonists to make

a thorough study of the classical folk-dialects, to which people first began to pay due attention after the publication of Boeckh's *Corpus Inscriptionum Græcarum.* Lachmann was in all respects the scientific partisan, leal, good-natured, and genial among friends, but a pitiless opponent. He insisted upon unconditional agreement. Whilst with an over-refined criticism he forcibly broke up the *Iliad* or the *Lay of the Nibelungs* into a number of separate songs, and whilst his demands upon himself were of the strictest possible order, at the same time he condemned the scientific errors of others as immoral weaknesses. The younger generation of philologists, growing to maturity under his influence, was composed of men who were more intolerant and arrogant than had been those of an earlier school, who had belonged to the century of humanitarianism. Yet this took place in a period when the gymnasia, overburdened with detail, were no longer able to maintain classical instruction at its old level. None the less, " Lachmann the severe " played his part as mediator. Through his instrumentality, an adjustment of the long-standing hostility between the philologists and the grammarians began. His precise textual criticism was invariably based upon a broad foundation of historical research, and his pupils involuntarily drew nearer to the philologist historians than had in earlier days the pupils of Gottfried Hermann.

Barely seventy years had elapsed since F. A. Wolf had ventured to enter himself at Göttingen as " studiosus philologiæ," but how mighty and widely ramified a tree had since then sprung from this offshoot of theology. In the renaissance epoch, a direct attempt had been made to revivify the modern world from the classical. Palladio had built his Olympic Theatre precisely in accordance with the rules of Vitruvius; Machiavelli's *Seven Books upon the Art of War* instructed the Florentines to take the Roman cohort as a model. German philology, on the other hand, had since the time of Niebuhr striven to make the days of antiquity vividly present to the imaginations of the new generation, endeavouring to animate and illumine the classical world by means of the modern, to open the distant and the alien to the historical comprehension of to-day, by calling to aid in elucidation the political, economic, and literary circumstances of the new age. Berlin and Leipzig, the two existing foci of linguistic science, were now joined by Bonn as a third focus. In the Rhenish university the philo-

logical spirit which had formerly been awakened by Niebuhr underwent a vigorous revival, now that in addition to the able æstheticist Welcker, Friedrich Ritschl the Thuringian, a powerful critic, an adept in the art of interpretation, and the leading living connoisseur of early Latin verse, had begun his valuable academic teaching career.

§ 5. THE NEW NATURAL SCIENCE.

Beside the enduring radiance of the historical sciences, the star of speculation gradually paled. Classical philosophy stood high above the popular faith. Christian philosophy stands beneath that faith; it forms thinkers, not sages; it does not transcend the sublime ethic of the gospels. Hence, after a season of blossoming, it has almost invariably been affected by an illusive arrogance, to which the inevitable sequence has been a relapse. Nowhere had this philosophy ever displayed its arrogance more wantonly than in Germany, with the result that upon the path which it had entered it could no longer indicate the way to others, but could merely keep itself in motion. Whilst the last of the Hegelians were still reiterating the formulas of the system, reiterating them with the old confidence but almost unheeded by the nation, Feuerbach had already formulated the propositions: "No philosophy, my philosophy; no sensuous existence is no existence at all." The culmination of this course of reasoning was the hopeless nonsense: "Man is what he eats." Feuerbach's lofty nature made it impossible for him wholly to repudiate an idealistic tendency; he continued to believe in a morality which was to harmonise another's impulse towards happiness with his own. In the north, however, freethinkers of all kinds were crying their wares in the market, undisciplined young fellows, whose solitary ambition was "to advance a step." Max Stirner's book *The Ego and his Own* annihilated spirit and humanity, law and the state, truth and virtue, as idols of the slave imagination, the author frankly declaring: "I know nothing greater than myself." A sect of egoists came into existence, closely akin to the "Freien" of Berlin. They held their revels in the Cellar Club in Coethen, and when the revolution broke out they sent their adepts to the barricades. In view of this widespread anarchy and decomposition, serious

thinkers among the philosophers recognised that the day for new systems had not yet come. Ritter, Zeller, and other distinguished scholars began a thorough reconstruction of the history of philosophy, for self-knowledge was the first need of a speculative science that had run wild.

The nation was sick unto death of philosophy. Its whole outlook had begun to change, since Germany, too, had been participating in the great movement wherein the natural sciences passed of a sudden from victory to victory. Yet how far behind the wealth of the intellectual sciences had we lagged through the millenniums; how childishly ignorant had been the attitude of our predecessors towards nature, the attitude of those who in poesy, eloquence, philosophy, and historiography had achieved such wonderful results. The explanation of this strange phenomenon is partly to be found in outward circumstances. Precise scientific observation of nature presupposes a high level of instrumental technique, and this again can only be the outcome of a lengthy history. How many centuries had human ingenuity to be at work before it became possible to produce the simple instrument by which we measure the temperature of the atmosphere. Another reason for the long delay is more deeply seated, lying as it does in the idealistic endowments of the human race. At the outset all the sciences arise to fulfil some immediately useful purpose. Experiences and esoteric teachings were recorded by the barbarians to subserve the ends of practical life. Among imaginative peoples, however, there soon manifested itself the independent theorising impulse extolled by Aristotle, the desire for knowledge for its own sake; and as soon as this impulse appeared, it was invariably directed at first towards the ideal world of the spiritual sciences. Just as all great peoples build temples before they build stately dwellings, cultivate art in its more exalted forms before they cultivate the petty arts that bear on the comfort of daily life, so also do they invariably concern themselves with history, law, language, and the ultimate nature of knowledge, before they devote themselves in earnest to the discovery of natural laws. This idealistic impulse of the human mind was frankly recognised by Goethe, one who himself cultivated and honoured the natural sciences, when he said: "The proper study of mankind is man, and the teacher who is competent to awaken a sentiment responsive to a single good deed or to a single good poem, effects more than the teacher who

records for us by form and by name whole series of classified natural objects." Natural science cannot display itself in all its strength until the spiritual sciences have long been preparing the way, just as language must have attained to full maturity of understanding before it can give effective expression to the propositions of natural science. Such a point in history had now been reached.

Philosophy was declining, but the energy and flexibility of thought which philosophy had bestowed upon the nation had been bequeathed even to the opponents of philosophy, and the new path of empirical research, of research free from assumptions, had already been indicated by the historians. The increasing wealth and the no less rapidly increasing economic needs of the civilised nations, the advances in technique, the requirements of more active intercourse, the tie with the new colonial dependencies (which, like the colonies of earlier days, valued none but the material goods of the old civilisation)—all these influences in cooperation awakened and intensified the impulse to study and to utilise the forces of nature. As invariably happens in epochs of great transformation, at the right moment the creative energy of history called forth the right men. The consequence was that the natural sciences, with a rapid advance practically unparalleled in human experience, now suddenly moved forward to catch up with the spiritual sciences which had gained so extensive a start. In this development the neighbour nations at first took the lead of the Germans, for trade and general wellbeing were recovering but slowly after the severe misfortunes we had suffered, and æsthetico-philosophical culture, which had acquired its greatest successes upon German soil, continued for a long while to display an effective antagonism to the new experimental science.

When the Germans at length began to play their part in the competition, promptly producing master works to sustain the ancient scientific renown of the nation, the minds of many were overpowered by a kind of materialistic intoxication. The half-cultured and many of the cultured overvalued the great transformation, for every new idea must be unduly prized to enable it to secure acceptance. The natural sciences directly fulfil the demand which Bacon made of all knowledge; they furnish power; their results are conspicuous; they transform manners and customs. In these very forties, when the Germans were still contemplating with amazement the marvels of their

new railways, the illusion became widely diffused that universal history had lost its ancient content, that the historic greatness of the nations was no longer revealed in politics and war, but in machines and manures, until unexpectedly in the years of revolution the majesty of the idea of the state was once again to be irresistibly demonstrated to all. People spoke easily of the control of nature by man, although weak mortals must content themselves with turning the individual natural forces to account by complying with their known laws. The current boast was that man had gained the victory over distance, although this victory was still an extremely modest one. Men had at length exceeded the swiftness of the horse, but he was still shamed by every pike and every swallow. People referred to the progress of mechanical technique and to the increasing facility of intercourse, as if these things were civilisation, whereas they are no more than means for the furtherance of civilisation. Posterity, no longer having any pecuniary interest in the question, will not ask how swiftly we could send our letters, but will enquire whether we knew how to diffuse great human ideas. Posterity will not fail to apply to the complexities of history the measures of the beautiful and the good as well as the measure of utility, and will therefore be certain to avoid the foolish opinion that a brilliantly illuminating but tasteless gas candelabra is a nobler product of human activity than a badly burning but beautiful Pompeian lamp.

Natural science attained to such splendid results in the field of research, and had so powerful an influence on practical life, that there was now good ground for demanding that the state should grant natural science the same advantages and privileges that were granted to the mental and moral sciences. As yet, however, everything was in its inception. Nowhere, so far, did there exist a public physical laboratory, though Magnus had at his own expense founded in Berlin an institution of this character, and had generously opened its portals to youthful students of the science. But amid the busy activities of the new political economy, there had rapidly come to the front a race of persons who were fanatics for utility and for universal progress, a breed which had been quite unknown to the quiet Germany of earlier days, types ridiculed by the Munich artists in their masked processions and comic papers under the nickname of "Mister Vorwärts." These persons had all paid a visit to England or America; they were interested

in every new railway company or factory enterprise (which were often mere swindles); they prized nothing but what could be counted, weighed, and measured. From these circles first came the cry which was eagerly reechoed by ignorant journalists, that training in natural science must become the basis of general culture, and that linguistic and historical education, upon which for thousands of years all civilised nations had been nourished, must be straightway dethroned from its high estate. More than once in the course of history similar demands had been voiced, always in times when the state and morality were falling into decay. In antiquity the suggestion had emanated above all from the Epicureans, the advocates of political and ethical quietism. The demand had recurred in the seventeenth century. But the results of such agitations had ever been insignificant, for the natural sciences have been and remain the province of technical experts; the writings of students of natural science can never become the common property of all cultured persons to the same extent as do the works of those who devote themselves to the mental and moral sciences.

Jacob Grimm now sounded a warning note at a meeting of the Teutonists. In concise and telling phraseology he showed that the spiritual sciences must necessarily be the foundation of general culture because they alone comprehend the whole of human life, including the world of the imagination and of the heart. He showed that they are at once cosmopolitan and national, whereas the natural sciences are cosmopolitan merely; and he showed that only where popular culture and universal human culture are mutually interpenetrative does history unfold its whole store of wealth. He gladly acknowledged all that our national life, and in especial the German tongue he so greatly loved, owed to exact research. The younger investigators of natural science wrote as a rule exceedingly well; their clear, definite, and simple prose exercised a wholesome disciplinary influence upon the German mind, which is so prone to fanciful reverie; but they could command no more than a small fraction of the immeasurable treasures of the language. In the style of the writer on exact science, who has to treat always of laws, concepts, genera, and species, the main emphasis is necessarily laid upon the inelastic noun. However perfect in its kind, this style cannot possibly compete with the mellower style of the historian, who freely contemplates

the world in process of fashioning, the world of unshackled activities, and can therefore lay the emphasis upon the vivid and life-radiating verb. The old law, moreover, was still valid, that the languages of civilisation owe their progress in the first instance to the folk-speech and to poesy, and subsequently to orators, historians, and philosophers. The new technical terminology fashioned for the uses of exact science was mainly international, and the arbitrary form of the terms sufficed of itself to show that they had not been created by the natural energy of the linguistic spirit, but had been coined of set purpose.

For the nonce the occasional exaggerations of the adulators of realistic culture were still devoid of danger. With well-grounded pride the nation could congratulate itself upon the bold discoveries of German investigators, and Humboldt, now advanced in years, esteemed himself happy to have lived on into this new day. Throughout life, almost alone at first, he had clung firmly to the method of scientific induction. He was now delighted to note that the younger generation could breathe only in the pure atmosphere of deliberate empiricism. In his *Cosmos* he summed up the work of his life. More than half a century earlier, upon his journey with Georg Forster, he had first mooted the question whether it was possible to comprehend and to represent nature in its entirety as an ordered whole. When he subsequently revealed South America to science, revealed that portion of the world which offers to the investigator the most manifold of natural phenomena, and when in later journeys he made additional observations of unrivalled value, the idea of his youth gradually ripened. In the first course of his Berlin lectures he had given the outline of his proposal for a physical description of the world.[1] Considerable time was then devoted to careful preparation, and when in 1844, after spending ten years in the press, the first volume of *Cosmos* appeared, the king greeted it with Goethe's verses: "At length, then, I hold it in my hands, and can in a sense term it mine."

On this occasion Frederick William spoke for every German, seeing that all felt that none but a German could attain to such universality of knowledge and thought. Humboldt said of his own work: "It cannot fail to mark an epoch in the intellectual development of mankind, in man's knowledge of

[1] See vol. IV, p. 221.

nature." He was the first to provide a survey of the whole of the created world, from the stellar spaces with their nebulæ down to the geographical distribution of the rock mosses. In the second volume, yet more richly stored than the first, he undertook what no one had hitherto ventured, a history of our outlook on the universe. He showed how throughout the centuries the image of the world had been reflected in the understanding and in the emotions of mankind, how heaven and earth had gradually drawn apart, in science, in the spirit of enterprise, and in the artistic sentiments. Since the progress of the human race can be indubitably demonstrated solely in the domain of expansive civilisation, we see that the optimism of the old century, to which Humboldt's own culture really belonged, was here holding its own. With agreeable warmth he showed how, despite "the injurious struggle between science and religion," the earth had continually become brighter, how man's horizon had been unceasingly widened, and how the day would inevitably dawn when in all seriousness it would be possible to repeat the bold saying of the seers of the renaissance: "Il mondo è poco."

In the third volume, when he began the detailed delineation of his picture of the world, the material grew under his hands, for the younger generation was passing without pause from discovery to discovery, and he was not destined to see the completion of the work. In truth, his *Cosmos* marked an epoch in our mental life, though in a very different sense from that in which Humboldt conceived the matter. The book stood, as it were, upon the dividing line between two ages, looking before and after. Quite in the spirit of the era of our classical poesy, it was regarded as a great work of art, whose function was to stimulate the mind, to gratify the æsthetic sentiments, "to delight the emotional nature," by the splendour of its descriptions. It was inspired throughout with the impulse towards many-sided culture which had animated the old century, and with the sentiments of a gentle humanitarianism whose amiable illusions the new age was already beginning to outgrow. Confident young historians could not possibly agree with the kindly veteran when he formulated the Rousseauist contention, "Nature is the realm of freedom"; or when from the lucidly demonstrated unity of the human race he blandly deduced the conclusion, "Some races are susceptible of a higher culture and some are more highly cultured than others; some are

ennobled by a spiritual civilisation; but there are no nobler races, for all are equally predestined for freedom." And yet this book, which so strongly recalled the days of Herder and of Goethe, was at the same time thoroughly modern, was a profoundly conceived and comprehensive encyclopædia of all that the empirical study of nature had hitherto achieved. Enthusiastic admirers spoke of *Cosmos* as "the Canticle of the new science," and referred in plain terms to "the age of Alexander Humboldt." The isolated voices of alarmed theologians who issued warnings against the unholy spirit of the book, did not disturb even the pious king, and were soon silenced amid the general chorus of admiration. Europe as a whole felt that but one man, once only, could have ventured to produce such a book.

But while Humboldt was actually writing, the world was already changing once more, and when the long-planned work at length saw the light it had ceased to be in perfect harmony with the spirit of the time. Youthful investigators often whispered to one another depreciatory and unjust estimates of *Cosmos*; especially the mathematicians, who could not pardon Humboldt for showing so little interest in their science. These young men in a hurry had scant respect for descriptions or historical retrospects; they demanded facts and discoveries, more and ever more discoveries. Nor, in truth, was the age poor in great discoveries. In the year 1840, in a little laboratory at Giessen, an investigation was completed which was to transform the agriculture of all civilised nations, although the author of this research had never guided a plough. Applying his studies in organic chemistry to agriculture, Liebig showed what substances the growing plant derives from the air and what substances it derives from the soil, and pointed out that it must be possible, by the use of natural or artificial manures, to restore fully to the soil the materials which have been withdrawn. By improvident agriculture the nations of earlier days had rendered desolate some of the finest regions of the earth. There now opened a hopeful prospect that in modern civilised lands intelligent agriculture would preserve in perpetuity the inexhaustible energies of the soil. After heated controversy had lasted for many years, the doctrine of "the circulation of life" was completely victorious. Stöckhardt's "Chemical Sermons" and other popular writings were widely circulated. Artificial manure, which even the experienced Thaer had looked

upon with mistrust, became indispensable to German agriculturists. As invariably happens in science, one discovery led to others, and Liebig was soon able to enrich both theory and practice by valuable deductions concerning the improvement and preservation of foodstuffs. It was not his fault that the new knowledge was grossly misapplied. Before long, adulteration of food set in upon a scale previously unparalleled, leading to such grave disorder alike to health and to morals that doubts might well arise as to whether the progress of chemistry had brought mankind a preponderance of blessings or of curses. The chemist of Giessen was regarded by foreign nations as the standard bearer of German natural science, and the day came when this proud and passionate man could say with confidence: "I will answer my adversaries with new and wonderful things."

At the very time when Liebig was writing about the circulation of organic matter, Schwann the Rhinelander, a pupil of Johannes Müller, founded a new theory of organic growth by his doctrine of the cell. He showed that animals and plants exhibit a general identity of structure and growth, and that all the tissues and organs of the animal body proceed from cells. The quiet, modest little man, who shortly afterwards found a new home in Catholic Belgium, and day in and day out devoutly attended early mass among the market women, gave the world little occasion to speak of him after this first great cast, but by his one fruitful thought he had broken a new trail for pathology and the kindred sciences.

Meanwhile the horizon of the physicists had likewise undergone a notable expansion when Dove discovered the law of storms, the basis of the new science of meteorology. This cheerful and gifted Silesian had long since made himself at home in the professorial world of Berlin, acquiring an enviable position at the university by his lively lectures. For a time his position was close to that of the Hegelians, and he wrote occasionally for their scientific annuals. But he confidently opposed the arrogance of the philosophers who wished to forbid him experiment as a mere handicraft, and the more intimately he became acquainted with Humboldt, the more firmly did he espouse the method of empirical research. He now had the joy of finding that his great discovery was to exercise almost as potent an influence upon agriculture as had been exercised by the researches of Liebig. At Humboldt's instigation a

number of meteorological institutes were established in the north, and there was good reason to hope that agriculturists would in future have a better basis for weather prediction, and that mariners would be warned of imminent storms.

In 1847 a decisive addition was made to physical theory. Hermann Helmholtz of Potsdam, a young army surgeon, regarded with contempt by the haughty officers of the hussar regiment of the guards, published his little work *The Conservation of Energy,* wherein he made the bold attempt to demonstrate the interrelationships between all the forces of nature, and to conceive physics as a doctrine of motion. Shortly before, though Helmholtz was unaware of the fact, similar ideas had been enunciated by the Heilbronn physician Robert Mayer, one of those unhappy individuals with a mind oscillating between genius and insanity who are far from uncommon among notable discoverers. Encouraged by Humboldt's approval, undismayed by the mockery and doubts of many of his colleagues, Helmholtz followed up the idea, and was able to replace the still dominant and semi-mythical notion of the interplay of natural forces by the lucid conception of a circulation of motion. He demonstrated that nature contains an indestructible and inalienable store of energy or effective driving force, which may appear in manifold forms, now as a raised weight, now in the momentum of masses in motion, now as heat or as chemical affinity. Thus was expressed the essential and leading thought of modern science, a thought no less weighty with consequence than had been Newton's law of gravitation, and it became possible to formulate a new system of natural philosophy based upon strictly demonstrated observations, although the completion of this system was necessarily postponed to an indefinitely remote day. Philosophically trained in the school of Kant, Helmholtz never ceased to cling to the principles of deliberate empiricism, until he ultimately became convinced that even the axioms of geometry are mere facts of experience, and that space in which other laws prevail is perfectly conceivable. In all these pioneer intelligences of the new natural science, the old and splendid German idealism still remained active. When conducting their researches in the realm of experience, they were at once too intrepid and too conscientious to ignore the limitations imposed upon experience. A lapse into the foolishness of materialism was left to the lesser men who succeeded them.

Medicine was at first influenced but little by the advance of natural science. With few exceptions, general practitioners continued to employ time-honoured and rough methods, endeavouring by means of emetics and purgatives, by cures at mineral spas, by setons and issues, to drive the dreaded evil humours and morbid materials out of the body, so that it was not to be wondered at that many of their ill-used patients should fly to the gentler methods employed by Hahnemann and the new homœopathic school. How shamefully scanty, indeed, knowledge of the human system still was. How many thousands of bodies had already been dissected, and yet no one knew what were the true functions of the spleen or the cæcum. Even the eye and the ear were still almost unexplored territory; physicians had to wait until perchance the physicists might provide them with instruments for the closer study of these noble organs. Surgery alone kept pace with the students of natural science. Universally admired were Stromeyer's orthopædic operations, and the Berlin students were proud of relating how their beloved teacher Dieffenbach could partially restore mutilated limbs by the new art of plastic surgery.

Thus did art and science begin everywhere to secure applications to the realities of life, but all too soon was it to become plain that the political culture of the time still lagged far in the rear of the intellectual culture.

CHAPTER VI.

GROWTH AND DECAY OF POLITICAL ECONOMY.

§ I. EXPANSION OF THE CUSTOMS UNION. LUXEMBURG, BRUNSWICK.

THE new outlook which was so vividly manifest in art and science was consciously or unconsciously determined, in part at least, by the great transformations in economic life. To the political economist, no epoch in German history exhibits a picture so full of change as does this nineteenth century, during which, in an unprecedentedly rapid succession, there occurred extensive revolutions in economic conditions and in party life. A generation earlier, a peaceful revolution from above had in Prussia burst the feudal fetters of the old society. At that time it was the opinion of almost all the leading intelligences of the nation that free competition of economic forces, an unrestricted right of private property, and the freedom of the individual worker, would secure social peace and progress throughout all future time. The new economic freedom was as yet far from universal throughout Germany. In most of the smaller states there still existed restrictions upon occupation, marriage, and the right of domicile, such as were no longer known in Prussia. Already in the forties a movement for the abrogation of these restrictions began. The advance was slow, was characterised by extensive relapses. Success was not attained until many years had passed, when the Germans had created their national state. The originators of the Prussian customs law had naïvely expected that the moderate protective tariff of Germany and the straightforward offer of reciprocity would gradually lead throughout Europe to something closely resembling universal free trade. By now it had become apparent that this hope was vain. The customs union speedily became engaged in severe economic struggles with nations whose wealth was of earlier date and whose egoism was more accentuated. The growing industries of Germany, in some cases with

good reason, but in other cases with bad, began to clamour for protection. Within the limits of Germany, free competition, far from bringing into being the anticipated just social order, led to new and deplorable class struggles. Mobile capital began to acquire dangerous powers; large strata of the legally enfranchised populace passed into a condition of economic servitude which was often resented more keenly than had been the patriarchal unfreedom of the old regime. Now by fierce anarchists, and now by philanthropic thinkers, the state was exhorted to utilise the coercive powers of its justice for the protection of the weak against the strong.

The gigantic accumulations of capital, the completely new economic forces, which sprouted luxuriantly in this age of invention, imposed upon the state obligations such as the legislators of the great period of reform had never foreseen. The old watchword had been "free individual activity"; now came the cry for enlarged efficiency of the state authority. Beuth, Hoffmann, Kühne, all the meritorious officials who had been Chancellor Hardenberg's righthand men, found themselves in an unknown world, for almost their cherished ideals were now doubted or denied. The king, whose eyes were fully open to the transformations in economic conditions, and whose gentle spirit led him to sympathise deeply with the sorrows of the working classes, had neither the energy of will nor the expert knowledge that might have enabled him to meet the demands of the new times. The consequence was that during these years of widespread disillusionment, even the Prusso-German economic policy, which had moved proudly from victory to victory during the last twenty years of the late king's lifetime, lost its fixity of purpose, and although the great acquirements of the previous reign were not sacrificed, nevertheless confusion and struggle, half-hearted and ill-considered ventures, were rife.

At the time of the late monarch's death the success of the customs union seemed practically assured, for Kühne had met the objections of the parsimonious financial party, and the new king, whilst still crown prince, had gladly accepted Kühne's views.[1] Eichhorn, shortly before relinquishing his old office, had dealt with the last outstanding difficulties, and had thus taken a worthy leave of the union to which he had devoted the best years of his life. On May 8, 1841, the customs

[1] See vol. VI, p. 102.

union treaties, with unimportant alterations, were renewed for twelve years, and all the lesser courts that were parties to the union expressed their lively satisfaction. Not one of them had entertained a desire to secede; everywhere the good cause had awakened the good spirit of federal harmony, and in all the states concerned the customs administration had proved thoroughly trustworthy. It had become impossible to deny the economic advantages of the customs unions. On the desolate Rheinschanz opposite Mannheim the young manufacturing town of Ludwigshafen sprang up with the rapidity of an Australian settlement, whilst the valleys of Westphalia, formerly so peaceful, now echoed with the noise of the hammers. The Germans had good ground for boasting that their recently established customs unity had far more significance than had the unity of neighbouring states which had been secured so much earlier, for the former had been gained through severe struggles, it had to be safeguarded and enlarged by new struggles, and it was to constitute the corner stone for our political unity. But the more clearly people now at length perceived the patriotic significance of the work, the more obvious did it become, when German national pride had been reinforced by the menace of war, that the young commercial league must compel foreign powers to recognise its equal rights.

Yet how inchoate and amorphous did the customs union still appear vis-à-vis the foreign world. Its territory was in truth practically land bound. Of its frontiers, measuring 1,089 miles [German], only 129 miles were seaboard. This coast line of Pomerania and East and West Prussia was the natural region of import for no more than a part of the eastern provinces of Prussia, not including Berlin. In the year 1843 the total shipping of its ports comprised 790 bottoms with a tonnage of 212,000, whilst in this same year the customs union imported 264,000 tons of colonial produce alone. Most of the shipping belonging to the customs union was suited only for short voyages in the Baltic, which, since the discovery of America, had gradually ceased to have much more importance than a lake. Moreover, the Sound dues imposed difficulties upon deep sea voyages from Baltic ports, and even Stettin, an aspiring coast town, possessed at this time no more than 24 bottoms with a total tonnage of 7,546. Hence this powerful commercial union, in whose territories there were 25,000,000 inhabitants, was almost exclusively dependent upon foreign

shipping, and especially upon the vessels owned by those German powers on the North Sea which did not belong to the customs union, whose territories were as a rule spoken of with delicate politeness as "the foreland of the customs union." Yet Germany's European neighbours were well aware that there was good reason to dread this half-formed power. Palmerston spoke, as usual, on behalf of his countrymen when in parliament he expressed the friendly hope that the first continental war would lead to the break up of the customs union. Richelot, the French economist, gloomily prophesied that Germany, when united, would become the leading commercial nation of the continent. In all her commercial parleyings with her neighbours Prussia encountered a jealous hostility of whose intensity our carping journalists had no conception. In the Americas, on the other hand, in Rio no less than in New York, people would disdainfully enquire: "Where is your Germany? We know the Prussian flag, the Kniphausen flag, and indeed seven other flags, which are proclaimed to be German, but those who sail under them acknowledge as many different sets of laws. We have never seen a German flag, a German consul to represent its interests, or a German warship to defend it. When the so-called German ships unload in our ports, the wares from their holds almost all bear English or French trade-marks."

The raillery went home, for if all the ports on the German coast were to join the commercial league of the fatherland, united Germany, without Austria, would command the second mercantile marine in the world. At this time Bremen alone had more large vessels of 1,000 tons burden and upwards than were possessed by the whole of France, whilst across the Atlantic there was no nation to compare with this in strength. The Rhine, the main commercial artery of the customs union, had long been obstructed, seeing that Holland had detached herself from the old fatherland for an incalculable period. All the more vigorous, therefore, was the demand that at least the North Sea coasts from the Ems to the Elbe, together with Hanover and the Hansa towns, should enter the national commercial union. This reasonable claim was voiced with especial insistence by South Germany, which had so recently learned the advantage of wider relationships, and found herself completely cut off from the ocean. But, as so frequently happened in the history of the customs union, North German

particularism was far more difficult to overcome than that of the south. The stubbornness of the South German courts had yielded owing to financial difficulties, but the coastal territories on the North Sea believed themselves extremely fortunate in their detached existence. With natural pride the Hansa towns pointed out that they had grown mightily without any assistance from Germany. Nothing but the wholesome compulsion of a masterful imperial authority was likely to make these self-satisfied Hanseats grasp the simple truth that the German seaports could not fail to flourish far more abundantly in alliance with the great fatherland.

The next requisite for the customs union, the extension of its frontier to the sea, appeared impossible at this juncture, and almost equally unrealisable for the nonce was the demand for a modification in the constitution of the commercial league. It is a peculiar merit of absolute monarchy that it can sometimes carry out a policy of ideas, whereas parliamentarism is everywhere and at all times dominated by the class interests of society. Nothing but the absolute power of the Prussian crown could have realised the ideal of German commercial unity, could have conducted to a happy ending all the widely ramified secret negotiations which eventuated in the formation of the customs unions. Hardly, however, had this new unity been effected when social interests and economic oppositions became manifest. There was a vociferous demand for publicity of the customs conferences, or for a customs parliament, or for an assembly of notables, so that every branch of industry and commerce could lay its claims before the nation. But how could these thoroughly reasonable and easily explicable parliamentary wishes be gratified, seeing that the customs union was not a state?

There thus devolved upon the leading power of the customs union a number of new and extremely arduous duties. The first success was to secure a small enlargement of the customs area. After a period of anarchy which had endured for nine years, the grand duchy of Luxemburg at length became a sovereign German federal state. It acquired an independent government, and upon October 12, 1841, there was instituted a modest representative constitution, in the drafting of which Hassenpflug had collaborated; [1] and since the territory was now widely sundered from the reduced kingdom of the Netherlands,

[1] See vol. V, pp. 386 et seq., vol. VI, p. 357.

the king-grand-duke proposed that it should join the customs union—to the delight of certain shrewd manufacturers, but to the horror of the powerful Belgo-French party, which continued to entertain hopes of reunion with Walloon Luxemburg. Prussia's finances and economic system had nothing to gain by the accession of this hostile little country, especially inasmuch as the curriers in the frontier towns of Malmedy and St. Veith took alarm, and continued to complain until the good-natured king assigned them a monetary compensation. Nothing but the German sense of duty, in conjunction with political calculation, induced the court of Berlin to discuss the question, but it was recognised that rejection of the Luxemburg proposals would either lead the grand duchy to enter the Belgian customs system, or would give rise to a dangerous smugglers' alsatia just without the gates of the customs union. The negotiations lasted for more than two years. The Prussian government jealously safeguarded the national independence of the customs union, absolutely refusing to give a foreign prince the right to vote in the council of the German commercial league. It was insisted that, at the customs conferences, Luxemburg must be represented by Prussia. The customs directorate of the grand duchy was to be controlled by the Prussian ministry of finance. Some of the posts in the customs service were to be filled by nominees from the states in the customs union, for, with good reason, the Germans had no confidence in the Luxemburg officials. On these conditions the treaty of accession was signed on August 8, 1841, and in accordance with the terms of the agreement Prussian officials at once made their way to Luxemburg to instal the new customs system immediately, so that evasion might be prevented.

A quite unexpected obstacle was now encountered. William II, the new king of the Netherlands, was very different in character from his sober-minded father. Restless and unstable, irritable and fanciful, he was perpetually busied with lofty designs, and was accessible to all possible suggestions. As Prince of Orange he had during the ten days' campaign routed the Belgian rebels, and he continued to hope that he would some day be able to deprive them of their prey. For this reason he favoured the Catholics, and was fond of associating with Belgian malcontents, while he would not permit a word to be said in his presence concerning the glorious eighty years' war, though this had founded the greatness of the house of

Orange. From childhood's days he had been on terms of intimate friendship with his cousin of Berlin, a man of almost exactly his own age. Frederick William, following the old tradition, treated the members of the house of Orange as Prussian princes. He regarded the partition of the Netherlands as a personal affront to the Hohenzollerns, and even during the confused dreams of his last illness, the misfortunes of his Orange cousins were often in his mind. The king of the Netherlands, confiding in his Prussian cousin's kind-heartedness now ventured upon an unexampled breach of faith. He had secretly taken into his counsels certain Luxembourgeois of the antiprussian party, and suddenly, without assigning any reason, declared that he could not ratify the treaty. It is possible that a hazardous plan actuated this decision. During these September days an Orange conspiracy was discovered in certain Belgian garrison towns. Two generals were implicated, and suspicion was entertained alike in Brussels and in The Hague that the king had believed the time to be ripe for a counter-revolution.[1] Whatever may have been the reason, the Orange ruler refused to ratify a treaty which his plenipotentiaries had signed after it had been drawn up precisely in accordance with his instructions. This could not be termed a breach of international law, but it was so dishonourable an infringement of international courtesies that Verstolk van Soelen, the veteran minister for foreign affairs, at once resigned, and various experienced diplomats who were successively asked to fill the vacant post declined to do so in the circumstances.

To the soft nature of King Frederick William it seemed ever a difficult matter, between friends, to deal with business in a businesslike manner. In a fraternal letter, he represented to his "beloved William" the folly and injustice of this sudden change of front, concluding with the honest declaration: "In summa, the non-ratification will be perfectly agreeable to us, but it will be a misfortune for Luxemburg, and an inexhaustible source of mortification (déboires) for you!" William II adroitly attempted to turn this accommodating mood to account. Replying to "Beloved Fritz" on September 15th, he wrote: "I am delighted to perceive, not merely that you have no intention of picking a quarrel with me, but that my non-

[1] This question has not yet been cleared up. Even de Bosch Kemper, who is always well-informed, ventures no more than to express suspicions (Geschiedenis van Nederland na 1830, vol. IV, p. 56).

ratification will be positively agreeable to you, since it will redound to the advantage of your own subjects." He went on to assure the king of Prussia that it would be a long while before the Luxembourgeois would become Germans, and that they would do this only from interested motives, should Germany protect their independence, instead of interfering with it.[1] Shortly afterwards Scherff, the Netherland federal envoy, appeared in Berlin, begging Prussia and the customs union for a formal approval of King William's withdrawal from the treaty he had approved. The newspapers of Luxemburg, whose sentiments were entirely Belgian, were already exulting, and were declaring that the unnatural severance of the two halves of the territory was at length to end.

Thereupon, however, Prussian pride was roused. General Dumoulin, the old and loyal guardian of the western march, implored the foreign office to remain firm. The proposal, he said, emanated from the party which for years had been "systematically endeavouring to separate Luxemburg completely from Germany and to uproot every vestige of German civilisation."[2] The exhortation took effect. Minister Werther assured the king in plain terms that to yield the point was impossible. The question at issue was one of high politics, whether Luxemburg was to belong to Germany, or to France and Belgium. Frederick William wrote once more to his cousin, this time most earnestly, saying: "I must therefore, dear and excellent William, repudiate in the most solemn manner all responsibility for the proposed non-ratification vis-à-vis the other governments of the customs union." He reminded the king that for years past the hostile policy of the Netherlands had aroused grave suspicion in Germany. "If only, dear William, you could play the great and beautiful role of reconciler!"[3] Thus did Frederick William continually vacillate between his royal sense of duty and good-natured weakness. It distressed him to have to dispute in this personal manner with his old friend. He now wished, therefore, that, through Austria's mediation, the controversy should be referred to the Bundestag. Nothing but the most urgent representations dissuaded him from this unfortunate step, which would infallibly

[1] King William II to King Frederick William, September 15, 1841.

[2] Dumoulin to Werther, September 23, 1841.

[3] Werther's Report to the king, September 29; King Frederick William to King William II, September 30, 1841.

have spoiled everything.[1] When the king of the Netherlands realised that the Prussians would not permit him to withdraw from the treaty, he had recourse to a new artifice, and despatched two Luxembourgeois plenipotentiaries to the aid of Scherff. These envoys, Simons and Pescatore, were in ill odour in Berlin as partisans of Belgium and enemies to Germany. They declared that the king-grand-duke was willing to ratify the treaty, but only for the term of one year, and with the right to terminate it at six months' notice. Such a proposal from such a source was manifest trifling. Frederick William alone failed to perceive its cunning. He was actually inclined to agree if Luxemburg would pledge herself not to conclude a commercial treaty either with Belgium or with France during the next four years. His ministers held other views. After the unfortunate dispute had lasted several weeks, Thile, Alvensleben, and Maltzan drafted a joint report to explain to the monarch what was obvious on the face of the matter. During the first year of operation, they said, a customs union always involves considerable losses. The Belgian party in Luxemburg would find no lack of pretexts for denouncing the treaty after it had been six months in operation, thus bringing the whole affair to naught. Prussia had great interests involved. If the crown were to allow itself to be flouted by a weak neighbour, her allies in the customs union would lose all confidence in her, and "upon this confidence alone," wrote Thile, "is based the entire edifice of the customs union."[2] The reasoning convinced Frederick William. He sent the two Luxembourgeois home, and wrote once more, in pressing terms, to his friend at The Hague (January 12, 1842): "The existing state of affairs is and cannot fail to be the physical and moral destruction of your grand duchy!!!!!! If you save yourself by coming over to the German side, your enemies will accuse you of inconstancy; but if you go to the other side, the bad side, you will have all Germany against you. And that means something, dear William, since the year 1840.[3]

The Orange ruler now gave up the game for lost. He

[1] Stolberg to Thile, October 1; Despatch from the foreign office to Thile, October 6, 1841.

[2] Reports to the king: from Maltzan, December 28, 1841; from Maltzan, Alvensleben, and Thile, January 3; from Thile, January 3, 1842.

[3] King Frederick William to King William II, January 12, 1842.

knew that all the German courts were speaking of him with contempt, and he was prudent enough to desire that the dishonouring affair should be settled with the utmost despatch. His reply was therefore friendly; and to his royal cousin, who had just gone to England for the christening of the Prince of Wales, he sent two new negotiators, the distinguished Netherland diplomatist Rochussen and van Heekeren.[1] The king met these negotiators at Bunsen's house in London, and on January 29, 1842, he approved a protocol which restored the August treaty. Luxemburg joined the customs union, for four years in the first instance; the number of Prussian officials in Luxemburg was to be as small as possible. In high delight he reported this upshot to his repentant cousin, and since at a festival of atonement the sacrificial lamb must not be wanting, he informed William in strict confidence that the envoy Count Lottum, who had expressed his opinion with Prussian bluntness concerning Orange integrity, was not to return to The Hague.[2]

Amid such alarums and excursions was the small western frontier territory admitted into the customs union, and hardly any other German land derived such notable economic advantages from the national commercial unity. The prolonged state of siege in the capital, and the almost lawless administration of the provisional Belgian authorities in the provincial districts, had devastated the country. Industry and commerce were at a standstill, and only smuggling flourished. Now orderly trade revived; the industrious population began to hope again; and lively business intercourse was soon afoot with the eastern neighbours, proving, to the astonishment of the Luxembourgeois, both stable and lucrative. Before long the grand duchy was receiving more than half a million francs per annum from the coffers of the customs union, a sum which far exceeded the modest consumption of the little country. Yet nobody thanked the Germans for such benefits. The Luxembourgeois could not forget how pitifully the Germanic Federation had sacrificed them during the year of revolution, whilst they detested the Prussians, the protectors of the federal fortress, as their natural foes. The grand duke did nothing

[1] King William II to King Frederick William, January 25, 1842.

[2] Protocol, London, January 29, 1842, signed Rochussen and Heekeren, approved by King Frederick William. Bunsen to Thile, January 29; King Frederick William to King William II, January 29, 1842.

to encourage Luxemburg towards closer kinship with German life. Law, administration, and coinage were still Belgo-French. In this essentially German land, even the language of official intercourse remained French, simply for the convenience of the Frenchified officials, who had without exception been students in French or Belgian universities, and who, on returning home, did their utmost to transform such traditional and honest place names as Klerf and Siebenbrunn into Clervaux and Septfontaines. Henceforward, therefore, there clung to Germany's mighty stem the loathsome parasitic plant of the "nation Luxembourgeoise" a mongrel folk without a fatherland and consequently without honour.

Meanwhile a brilliant prospect had unexpectedly opened for the customs union. The Hanoverian tax union, which had hitherto barred the customs union from the German Ocean, seemed about to break up. The tax union had at first displayed hostility to the great customs union in manifold ways, and had above all treated the Prussian enclaves abominably. But in 1837 a customs cartel had been arranged between the two unions, and thenceforward they had lived on fairly amicable terms, although Hanover had been rather lax as regards smuggling. Prussia therefore determined to bide her time, in the hope that the Guelph realm, now almost completely surrounded by customs union territories, would voluntarily propose to join the customs union. Yet there was, in truth little hope that Hanover would take such a step. The moderate tariff of the tax union gave an abundant yield, and the country was flooded with cheap English manufactures. To Ernest Augustus it was merely matter for satisfaction that this excessive foreign competition completely checked the development of Hanoverian manufacturing industry. He had no love for factories, and just as he made it his habit to eat his English mutton chop for breakfast, so was he extremely pleased when his Hanoverians did their utmost to affect English habits of life. His subjects shared these views, and were wont to voice their compassion as they informed the poor hungry folk of the customs union how much more claret and coffee, how many more cigars, were, thanks to the low tariff, consumed in the territories of the tax union. This proud contention was based upon dubious estimates, for there was no falling off in Brunswick's consumption of foreign produce when that

country subsequently joined the customs union, but it gained universal credence. When the inland regions were loudly demanding that the territories of the tax union should join the customs union, there appeared in a Hanoverian newspaper a song of defiance which faithfully reflected the Guelph mentality:

> We will not, will not have it,
> The Prussian Zollverein. . . .
>
> . . . . . .
>
> What's more, in every punchbowl
> We'll have Jamaica rum,
> And we will smoke the finest weeds
> That from the Indies come!

In the beginning of the year 1841 the allied states had harmoniously arranged to renew the tax union treaties. But towards the close of the negotiations Brunswick demanded that Hanover should abandon the construction of the new road between Salzwedel and Uelzen, for this undertaking, which Hanover was conducting jointly with Prussia, threatened to injure the trade of the old route from Magdeburg by way of Brunswick to Lüneburg. The Brunswickers thus suggested that the Guelph court should break faith with Prussia, since the joint work on the Salzwedel-Uelzen road had been agreed upon at Hanover's suggestion. Nevertheless the Hanoverian plenipotentiary agreed to Brunswick's proposal, his government approved the step, the treaty was signed, and all that remained was the exchange of ratifications. On further consideration, however, the Guelph sovereign recognised that the clause concerning the road was improper, and he subsequently asked for additional alterations. His conduct thus resembled that of the king-grand-duke of Luxemburg, except that Ernest Augustus could at least adduce respectable grounds for his belated change of mind. Thereupon the duke of Brunswick's wrath flamed up. Duke William had long been annoyed by the arrogant tone which the Hanoverians were wont to assume towards the lesser courts. He now opined that his "dignity," his "prestige," his "rights," had been endangered by his neighbour's breach of faith; and in a holograph letter he informed the Guelph king of his withdrawal from the tax union. His hostile onslaught on Prussia having miscarried, he now turned for help—to Prussia! So audacious a change

of front was new even in the history of the customs union, wherein so much was written anent the impudence of the petty states and the long-suffering of Prussia. At the end of March the director of the Brunswick college of finance came to Berlin. Von Amsberg was a capable statesman, and an able economist. More liberal-minded than his master, he already contemplated the customs unification of the entire fatherland. He carried a despatch from the Brunswick ministry of state, conveying the laconic announcement that "suddenly arising hindrances have prevented the renewal of our tax union treaties with the kingdom of Hanover and the grand duchy of Oldenburg." The envoy then requested that the duchy should be admitted to the customs union.[1]

The Prussian court did not consider that duty called for the passing of moral judgments upon this unedifying quarrel in the Guelph household. Indeed, the situation had a tragicomical flavour, for unwelcome as was the offer from this recently converted friend, Prussia could not venture to reject it out of hand. The little Brunswick territory, with its complicated frontier, could not, taken alone, be regarded as in any sense a valuable accession to the customs union. Minister Alvensleben, discussing the matter with General Berger, the Hanoverian envoy, spoke with a friendly frankness which the veteran soldier gratefully recognised, and the minister actually endeavoured to effect a reconciliation between the two Guelph courts.[2] But the attempt was vain. The wrathful Brunswicker declared that if his duchy were not accepted into the customs union, it would remain isolated. This implied the menace that a centre of contraband would be created once more in the very heart of the customs union, and the traders in the small towns of the Harz region were already looking forward with delight to the revival of the golden age of smuggling. This dread compelled the minister to recommend to the king that Brunswick should be received into the union, but with the proviso that Hanover, "which, like Brunswick, is nearly ripe for entering the union," should at least declare her readiness to open negotiations.[3] Hanover gave a pro-

[1] Canitz' Reports: Hanover, April 2, 1841; Vienna, March 4, 1844. Despatch from the Brunswick ministry of state to the Prussian ministry for foreign affairs, March 28, 1841.

[2] Berger's Reports, April 4, 7, and 30, 1841.

[3] Werther's Report to the king, April 8; Cabinet Order to Werther and Alvensleben, April 21, 1841.

visional assurance to this effect; all the members of the customs union were in agreement with the proposal; it was universally believed that the great enterprise was now fairly under way. It really seemed possible that at one stride the customs union would be extended to the mouths of the Elbe, the Weser, and the Ems, and would subsequently be able to induce the Hansa towns to join the league. Brunswick territory extended in a narrow strip far westward, from the Harz mountains to the Weser. Should the entire duchy join the customs union, the Göttingen and Grubenhagen regions, dignified in Hanover with the pretentious name of "the southern provinces," would be cut off from the main territory of the Guelph kingdom, and the tax union, already of loose construction, would be yet further disintegrated.

But what did the old Guelph ruler care for political economy? In these negotiations the conduct of King Ernest Augustus was crooked throughout, and he entered into them merely in the hope that he might still be able to secure free communications with his southern provinces. Kielmansegge, Hanoverian envoy in London, received an autograph letter: "I am opposed to the customs union, and whatever happens I shall not fail to avoid injuring England's interests. No one surely could take this amiss in an English prince." In his visits to England, he again and again assured the ministers (as the Prussian envoy in London learned directly from Lord Aberdeen) that no power on earth should ever induce him to enter the Prussian union. He felt that it would besmirch his honour should he now be forced into such a step by the detested Brunswick. It need hardly be said that the British encouraged Ernest Augustus to stand his ground, although Aberdeen assured the credulous Bunsen that Hanover's accession to the customs union would reinforce the free trade party in that body, and would therefore be welcome to England.[1] The Guelph ruler could rely upon his subjects. In the Hanoverian press the peasant pride of the Lower Saxons was securing clamorous and repulsive expression. Well-fed and content they had no thought for the needs of the great fatherland. The Hanseats did their utmost to foster this refractory spirit.

In Bremen, which always displayed more patriotism than Hamburg, the question of joining the customs union had already been mooted, but Bremen could not venture to walk

[1] Bunsen's Reports, October 28 and December 10, 1842; March 26, 1844.

alone in this matter, for she would risk losing all her transit trade, which would pass to the wealthier city of Hamburg. In the latter port, during the prolonged separatist life of the Hanseatic league, sentiments had been generalised which might just as well be denominated unduly broad-minded as unduly narrow-minded. There prevailed in Hamburg a purely mercantile conception of political life, in accordance with which the state was looked upon as nothing more than a vexatious oppressor, as the natural enemy of free commerce. Moreover, the Hamburgers looked down with republican arrogance upon the alleged unfreedom of the Prussian monarchy. Hanseatic commerce had maintained the position of a world power in days when the fatherland was in a state of profound abasement. It is not surprising that the Hanseats were inclined to overestimate the value of their services, and to attribute to the profound wisdom of their commercial policy a success which was no more than the natural outcome of the position of their towns as markets for an industrious and thickly populated hinterland. They hardly troubled to ask themselves why London and Liverpool, New York and Marseilles, should thrive behind the protection of national customs barriers, or why at the mouths of the Rhine, the Meuse, and the Scheldt, likewise under the restrictions of national tariffs, there should exist a whole series of flourishing commercial cities. In Hamburg it was an article of faith that nature had doomed Germany to an everlasting commercial policy of self-mutilation. Nature had so formed the mouths of the Elbe, the Weser, and the Trave, had separated these mouths so completely from the country which the rivers drained, that they must for ever continue to constitute "a free coast." It was true that no one could furnish a demonstration of this wonder of nature.

The chief reason for the prevalence of particularism in Hamburg was to be found in the inertia of her merchants, who, when the right moment had come to modify traditional business methods, which had been practised with masterly skill, could not seize the propitious hour. They continued, as in the old Hanseat days, to regard transit trade as their chief source of income. They had made their city a great and free market for all Scandinavia, and they could not see that an even richer future was within their grasp if they would but enter into free trading relationships with the manufacturing forces of the hinterland, forces which had of late undergone

so marvellous an expansion. By a well-conducted open port, the transit trade to the north could be continued undisturbed. No less obstinate than had formerly been the merchants of Leipzig and of Frankfort, they were in revolt against their own good fortune, glorying like their prototypes in detachment from the fatherland, extolling that detachment as commercial freedom, and despising the far more perspicacious Prussian officials. Their literary spokesmen, the learned patriot Wurm no less than the blind particularists of the *Hamburger Korrespondent*, could find nothing but empty words on behalf of the ideal of practical German unity. Whilst from time to time they would speak yearningly of the customs unification of the fatherland, on these occasions they invariably added the impossible proviso that Austria must first join the customs union. When they patronisingly commended Prussia's labours on behalf of a unified coinage and a unified system of weights and measures, it never occurred to them that Hamburg would do well to follow this excellent example, and to adopt the well-tried thaler standard in place of her ridiculous duplex monetary system. It was undeniable that the enormous majority of the population of the North Sea littoral had no desire to surrender its separatist existence. Klefekir in Hamburg, Berg in Oldenburg, von der Horst in Hanover, and a few other far-seeing publicists who advised adhesion to the customs union, could effect nothing in face of the universal prejudice.

At this period King Frederick William considered Hanover and Electoral Hesse to be Prussia's two closest friends in the Germanic Federation, for Bavaria was on very bad terms with the northern power, and he thought that the other middle-sized states would show little ability to withstand the liberals. He therefore treated his Guelph uncle with extreme consideration, and despite the reluctance of the Brunswickers he insisted that the Harz circle and the Weser circle of Brunswick, which were intersected by the territory of the Guelph kingdom, should for two years remain in the tax union, so that time might be given to the Hanoverian court to prepare for its adhesion to the customs union. The Hanoverians displayed scant gratitude for this friendly concession. Allowing months to elapse, only after repeated exhortations did they at length open the promised negotiations, and they began them by suggesting two equally unacceptable conditions. They demanded that the customs union should reduce its tariff upon several

of the most lucrative foreign imports; in addition they insisted that the kingdom of Hanover must be granted preferential treatment, must receive a larger proportion of the common income, in compensation for the presumably greater consumption in the Guelph land. For the sake of the two million Germans in the tax union, the twenty-eight millions of the customs union were to reduce the yield from some of the most lucrative elements in their tariff. The second condition conflicted with the essential ideal of the customs union, the equal distribution of revenue proportional to population. For the sake of this principle, the Prussian government had, only three years earlier, hastily dropped the unlucky proposal to claim a moderate preference for itself. How could Prussia now demand from her customs allies a much greater preference for Hanover, when Brunswick had just joined the union without asking for preferential treatment?

To the South German courts, which had so earnestly endeavoured to secure increased protection for their budding industries, the Hanoverian memorials could not fail to sound like voices from topsyturvydom. The Guelph crown looked for the sinews of economic life in vigorous consumption, and proudly boasted that the accession of Hanover to the customs union would bring in two millions of active consumers whose manufactures were insignificant, and that this would be an unprecedented advantage to the customs union. The Hanoverians ignored the consideration that these two millions were to secure through the customs union their first chance for free trade and the possibility for establishing manufactures of their own. Doubtless in the coastal regions of Hanover the consumption of imported goods might be somewhat higher than in other parts of customs union territory, but there was no possibility of discussing the monetary basis of preferential treatment as long as the economic outlooks of the respective parties were so widely divergent. Apart from this, the Guelph court continually displayed its ill-will. In the summer of 1843 Councillor Witte, a Hanoverian financier, brought proposals to Berlin. He bluntly asked the Prussian ministry to come to a decision, to take it or leave it. He brazenly contended that the customs union desired, to the detriment of Hanover, to establish "smuggling depots" in the Harz and the Weser circles. He threatened reprisals. Even in the stormy customs union negotiations, such language had

not been heard since those remote days when the duke of Coethen had sent a pugnacious lieutenant to Berlin with an ultimatum.[1] Bülow's reply was curt. He said that Witte's communication required no answer, and suggested to the Hanoverian that he had better leave Berlin forthwith.

In the interim the court of Brunswick had been growing more and more angry, for the ancient hatred between the two Guelph lines had flamed up anew. The diet loyally supported the duke, for most of the deputies had at length realised the national importance of the customs union. Steinacker, their leader, in a polemic writing against the Hanoverians, declared in sanguine mood: "Fatherland! thy name has long been an empty word to us. But now we know that we have a fatherland, and one which is undergoing a healthy process of rejuvenescence." How finely did these words ring when contrasted with the arid invectives of Zimmermann of Gotha, the man who had once defended the Hanoverian coup d'état, and who now, publishing *Political Sermons from the Housetop* and writing under the pseudonym of Faber, rallied once more to the side of Ernest Augustus. The author did not attempt to hide that the Guelph court had by no means abandoned the sentiments which had in former days led to the founding of the Mid-German commercial union. He admitted that Hanover was still hostile to the customs union; he exhorted the Germans to take "the mighty foreign world," and especially England, into their consideration; and he did not hesitate to say, "I regard as either fools or knaves all those who advocate a second unity of Germany, whether within or without the Germanic Federation." These rude attacks compelled the court of Berlin to disclose more plainly than ever the national aims of its commercial policy. The *Preussische Allgemeine Zeitung*, an official organ, declared that Prussia's task in the customs union would be fulfilled when the union had been extended to include the entire federal area, so that the commercial unity promised in article 19 of the federal act should have been established. It will be noted that a cautious silence was preserved concerning the non-accession of Austria to the customs union. Even King Frederick William continued to regard this non-accession as an indispensable condition.

[1] See vol. IV, p. 281.

When his envoy in Vienna had discussed with Metternich the dispute that was in progress, Bülow hastened to send Canitz instructions to the effect that a friendly word from Austria to Hanover could do no harm, but that Berlin could never permit the imperial court to interfere directly in the affairs of the customs union.[1]

These strained negotiations had continued for nearly three years when they were broken off early in 1844. Brunswick at length joined the customs union with its entire territory, whilst the tax union remained in existence, although its domain had been disintegrated. After further acrimonious disputes, the customs cartel was renewed. The three cabinets that had been concerned in this affair endeavoured to justify their conduct in published official writings, and far from edifying was the way in which the two enraged Guelph courts washed their dirty linen in public. The Prussian official document was couched in more measured language; it was strictly to the point, and convinced all Germany, the unteachable Hanoverians and the Hanseats excepted. Meanwhile Ernest Augustus had revisited his old fatherland, and, after the customary oath, had taken his seat once more in the house of peers, despite Aberdeen's representations to the effect that neither King Leopold nor Prince Albert had stooped to such a step. The relationships between the king of Hanover and the English court remained cool, for Queen Victoria suspected her uncle of a design to sow disaffection in the upper house. None the less he secretly discussed with the British ministers a move against Prussia.[2] On July 22, 1844, he signed a navigation treaty with England, by whose terms the accession of Hanover to the customs union was rendered impossible for five years to come. Great Britain conceded certain advantages to the Hanoverian flag, and acquired for her own vessels a mitigation of the notorious Stade Elbe-dues, which, at the Dresden Elbe navigation conferences of 1842 the Hanoverians had obstinately reinforced as a navigation tariff against their German fellow-countrymen. The Guelph kingdom, even after its detachment from the English crown, thus remained for British commercial policy a bridgehead upon the continent.

[1] Bülow, Instruction to Canitz, March 17, 1844.
[2] Bunsen's Reports, June 10 and August 10, 1843.

§ 2. THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN PROTECTION AND FREE TRADE.

Berlin was much distressed at the paucity of the results of these negotiations with the Guelph courts, for Prussia's prestige in the customs union had already been shaken by an economic party struggle initiated in 1841 by the publication of List's book, *The National System of Political Economy.* Many people had at that time failed to grasp the simple truth that political economy is one of the sciences based upon the record of direct experience, and that its mutual reactions with the facts of daily life are incessant. But in the Germany of the forties this truth was strikingly manifest. In all the other sciences the Germans had long ere this struck out paths of their own, but in economics our theorists remained obstinately and extraordinarily anachronistic. Almost blindly they continued to accept the teachings of the foreign world, the reason being that our industrial and commercial progress was of such late date. Unity was not yet fully secured in the national market. The formation of great economic parties was only just beginning.

The Scottish sensualist philosophy had never secured much vogue in our country, and it had been effectively refuted by Kant. Yet in the field of economic science there continued to prevail in Germany the doctrine of Adam Smith, which stands or falls with sensualism. By Ricardo and Say this doctrine had been reconstituted with one-sided rigidity, and had been popularised by the vigorous writings of Bastiat. When the need of the hour had been the overthrow of the feudal order of society, this doctrine had proved a liberating force, but it now lingered in German universities as nothing better than a sterile tradition. Following the petrified method of the teachers of the old law of nature, a method which every efficient jurist had long since abandoned, the political economists were accustomed to deduce their propositions as logical inferences from the abstraction of the economic man who buys in the cheapest and sells in the dearest market. The harmony of all interests, the just and rational ordering of society, were to issue from the struggle between the conflicting egoisms of such individual economic men, were to be the outcome of the free interplay of social forces; the animal impulse of selfishness was to work a miracle, was to lift men

above the status of the beasts. Persons of refined sensibilities, able to realise that this doctrine was ungerman, were none the less willing to ascribe such a miraculous power to enlightened selfishness, for they failed to realise that selfishness cannot possibly be enlightened, cannot from the low levels upon which it perforce exists gain an extensive outlook across the wide vistas of national life. The theory rested upon an unhistorical optimism which completely ignored the two great forces of universal history, the force of stupidity and the force of sin, and through ignoring these things it was able to arrive at the logical conclusion that increasing understanding of self-interest would suffice to put an end to crime. It is true that Schmitthenner, Eiselen, and certain other notable advocates of the protective system, were lecturing in German universities, and that C. H. Rau of Heidelberg, a thoughtful follower of Adam Smith, was accumulating in his text books abundant statistical material, whereby from the fulness of experience to amplify or to restrict the individual doctrines of the system. But the opinion was still dominant that everywhere and at all times the world of commodities was regulated by immutable natural laws.

List's book broke like a thunderclap into this dream life of abstract theory. He attacked individualism with patriotic passion, and attacked likewise (it practically amounts to the same thing) the cosmopolitanism of the dominant school. He showed that the economy of every nation constitutes a living whole, that all its members are members of one another, and that "individuals derive the greater part of their productive powers from the political organisation of the government and from the strength of the nation." With no more than a moderate equipment of historical knowledge, but with a happy faculty for historical insight which enabled him as a rule to discern what was essential, he described the economic evolution of the great nations, showing how they had all maintained themselves in existence by means of fierce struggles for power, competing one with another, and he pointed out how every one of them had protected home industries by tariffs and monopolies.

Upon the foundation of these historical experiences he now proceeded to build up his own protective system, which differed in certain important respects from the old mercantile system. He did not consider that the wealth of nations

was at all dependent upon the abundance of the noble metals, but he recognised what was denied by the free traders, the importance of the balance of trade, seeing that the degree of economic civilisation in a nation can be approximately estimated from the value and the kind of imports and exports. He demanded protective tariffs as a means of encouragement and education, so that new productive forces might be awakened—of course by the using up of exchange values. In this way the nations of the continent would be freed from the oppressive domination of English commerce, with the ultimate result that "we should buy from those only who buy from us." Fascinated by the contemplation of the young and aspiring North American world, it seemed to him that everything depended upon prosperity, especially in industrial enterprise, and he boldly insisted that the activity, the culture, even the morality of the nations, increases everywhere proportionally with increase in wealth. By prosperity he hoped to educate his deeply loved nation towards freedom, to liberate it from hypocrisy, philistinism, and dreams of cuckoo-cloudland. "Upon the development of the German protective system"—this remained his fundamental idea—"hangs the independence and the future of the German nation."

On this occasion his seer's vision, which was rarely at fault, erred. Germany was to upbuild her new realm without high protective tariffs, and was not to adopt the protective system until much later, when her political power had already long been assured, and when the condition of the world market had been completely transformed. None the less his book was a milestone in the history of our political culture. For the third time this intrepid thinker, who had contributed to the foundation of our commercial unity and to the establishment of the German railway system, issued a clarion call to the nation. Hitherto in Germany political economy had been regarded almost with aversion, had been looked upon as an esoteric doctrine of mathematical formulas. List was the first writer to make it comprehensible and acceptable to his fellow-countrymen by vivid and luminous exposition. Disregarding on principle all cut and dried doctrines, he looked upon the science solely from the standpoint of historical experience and practical business knowledge. With fiery eloquence and with many exaggerations he showed that the

great economic questions are questions of national power, and that their solution is decisive for the self-maintenance of the nations. This was his supreme service. It was impossible to proclaim such a truth too loudly or too clearly to a people which displayed its cosmopolitan weakness above all in commercial activity, exhibiting an undignified preference for foreign goods. For this reason the foreigners who counted upon Germany's weakness were outraged by List's writing. The English press enquired in a tone of sanctimonious concern how so barbarous a sentiment of national exclusiveness could possibly prevail among the humane and cultured Germans. Even Count Camillo Cavour, whose admiration for free trade views was summed up in the simple phrase that they were the "rette dottrine," termed the Swabian writer's book a morbid outcome of excessive national pride.

At the outset the specialised branches of science were little influenced by the ideas of List, who was, moreover, quite free from professorial ambitions. But it frequently happens that the creative energy of history leads the ideas for which the time is ripe to spring simultaneously from two utterly diverse sources. Wilhelm Roscher, a young man of Hanoverian birth, who in 1848 became professor at Leipzig university, formulated his ideas quite independently of List, the designs for his fruitful activities as a teacher being the outcome of abstract scientific considerations. He wished to awaken for political economy the same historic sense which jurisprudence owed to Savigny, Eichhorn, and Niebuhr. In his *Elements of Political Economy* (1843) he had given the first outlines of his historical method. He conceived the world of economics as a developing world. It was his aim to show that theory can discover relative truths only, and that institutions which help a nation onward in the days of its youth, become fetters when it has attained maturity. A man of the widest possible learning, no less modest, just, and pacific, than List was self-assertive, biased, and pugnacious, in current disputes he saw by no means eye to eye with the Swabian agitator, for Roscher's views inclined rather towards free trade. The only things common to the two men were the historic sense and a recognition of the moral forces of economic life. Whilst List's book gave rise to passionate party struggles, Roscher's *Elements* made its way slowly and quietly, giving the initial impulse towards the

gradual growth of a new realistic and historical conception of political economy. As years passed there came into existence a distinctively German school of economics, which before long manifested its superiority to the schools of other lands.

List did not hesitate to mint into small change the silver ingots of his *National System of Political Economy*. In 1843 he founded the *Zollvereinsblatt*, and round the banner of this bellicose periodical there soon assembled all the protectionists of the south, in especial the younger manufacturers and technicists, many of whom were cultured, efficient, and energetic, having been trained in the new technical schools. In Baden the movement was broadly based, for here the new manufacturing enterprises had for the most part been founded by joint stock companies, and the shares had been largely bought by peasants and members of the lower middle class. Indisputably the protectionists could adduce cogent reasons in support of a number of their demands, but it was no less obvious that the parochial spirit played a contributory part in the formation of their opinions. Prussia's social freedom was still an unknown blessing in the south. The South Germans, being accustomed to demand the approval of the authorities in matters concerning marriage and domicile, were naturally inclined to look upwards for salvation in commercial affairs as well. Deffner, an Esslingen manufacturer, was conspicuous among the protectionists of Würtemberg; Sander, a fiery orator, played a notable part in the Badenese chamber; on the Rhine, Böcking of Saarbrücken, director of a mining company, was to the fore. The powerful banking firm of Haber in Carlsruhe provided most of the South German newspapers with protectionist correspondence, whilst Cotta placed the *Allgemeine Zeitung* and the *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift* at the disposal of the protectionists. In the south, before long, it was regarded as a truism that every liberal must be a protectionist, and that every free trader was necessarily a reactionary. Once again it became plain that while List could give the initial impulse to a movement and could animate its progress, he was unable to keep within bounds, and lacked organising capacity. Just as in former days he had railed against the Prussian customs law although this realised his own ideals, so now did he discharge a volley of invectives upon the commercial policy of Prussia, and endeavoured to undermine confidence in the leading power of the customs

union even though he clearly recognised that Prussian hegemony was indispensable. In his blind rage, this honest enthusiast could not realise that he was unchaining the elemental forces of hatred and dissension. Abel and the whole army of the Bavarian ultramontanes joined gleefully in the chorus. Ere long the old cry was raised that the incapable Prussia must hand over to Austria the leadership of the customs union, a demand which List himself would certainly never have approved.

Among all the dangers which threatened the customs union, a lack of confidence between the north and the south was the gravest. Complete mutual understanding between Prussia and Hesse on the one hand and Bavaria and Würtemberg on the other had been the foundation of the union, and should the understanding be broken, the beginnings of practical German unity would be destroyed. It was the tragedy of List's stormy life that this enthusiastic patriot, whose ardent love embraced the entire fatherland, was nevertheless to widen the breach between the south and the north. There were good reasons for a protectionist agitation, but he conducted it with such intense bitterness as to revive in full intensity the prussophobia which had just begun to subside in the south. The seed of discord now scattered was to bear disastrous fruit after many days. As late as the year 1866, echoes of this protectionist hatred continued to resound in the South German press, and above all in the periodicals issued by the house of Cotta. Although Prussia had demonstrably made extensive financial sacrifices on behalf of the customs union, a humorous cartoon giving a positively topsy-turvy view of the matter was widely circulated in the south, showing the cow of the customs union held by the patient South German Michael while Prussia milked her. Even List did not hesitate to accuse the Prussian government of exploiting the customs union. Again and again he uttered wild demagogic accusations, and his followers outdid their leader in this respect. List complained that defenceless Germany was being plundered by the commercial policy of foreign countries, ungratefully forgetting that the customs union had already in all essential respects broken the economic dominion exercised by the foreign world, so that the only question that remained for consideration was the desirability of more effective protection for certain branches of industry.

This dry business problem, what import duty it was possible to place upon a commodity, was debated with as much fury as if none but traitors to their country could differ from the champions of any particular view. Persons with an inborn love of battle delight in picturing their enemies in grotesque form. Just as Luther termed Cochläus a "sniveller" and the duke of Brunswick a "pantaloon," in order to tear these caricatures to tatters, so did List, in his *National System*, attack, not merely the "legal plague" of the pandects, but also a mythological monster which he termed "the school" and to which he attributed every conceivable sin. His latest bugbear was "the Prussian bureaucracy, this semi-oriental excrescence, this tentacular growth which strangles the German state." Henceforward, he said, the German customs league must be controlled by the living experience of men of business instead of by the hidebound traditions of the council chamber. It was true enough that the one-sided bureaucratic guidance of the customs union was in urgent need of reinforcement by popular energies, but the matter was far from being so simple as List imagined. Who had founded the customs union? The German officialdom had founded it, and had done so in unceasing conflict with the folly of merchants and manufacturers. What was now the obstacle in the way of the natural expansion of the union? The opposition to this expansion did not come from the officials but from the experienced traders of the Hansa towns.

The first duty of every publicist worthy the name is to put himself in the place of those upon whose actions he is commenting, but List did nothing of the sort vis-à-vis the state upon which he lavished his invectives. The Prussian government had to conduct a union whose tariff could be modified only by a unanimous vote—it will be remembered that this condition had been insisted on by South Germany. It was impossible, therefore, for Prussia blindly to accept the wishes of either of the two contending economic factions; it was necessary for her to mediate between them, for otherwise the whole union might fall to pieces. Since List had never troubled himself to gain adequate understanding of Prussian affairs, he knew nothing of the men who guided Prussia's commercial policy, and unhesitatingly affirmed that this policy was solely dictated by consideration for England. The reproach was natural enough, for the anglomania of the

new court was notorious. None the less, there was no justification for this particular suspicion, for the three leading anglomaniacs in Prussian governmental circles were the king himself, Bülow, and Bunsen, all of whom were ardent protectionists. On the other hand, Kühne, Beuth, and the remaining bureaucratic opponents of a high tariff, were ultra-prussian in sentiment and were entirely free from English leanings. If they opposed List's plans, this was solely because they still clung firmly to the ideas of the Hardenberg era, and because they were unable to recognise that their customs law, which dated from a quarter of a century back, was now sadly in need of repair.

The immoderate railings of the South German protectionists could not fail to arouse suspicion, however unjust, in the minds of members of the opposite party. In Berlin, no one could understand why List, an ardent liberal, should hobnob with the companions-at-arms of Metternich and Abel. The Prussian envoys at the South German courts were united in the belief that this man, who was in truth absolutely incorruptible, was in Austrian and Bavarian pay. Even Canitz, of brilliant intelligence and fine sensibilities, wrote: "No doubt he would not sell his convictions, but he is willing to lend them to anyone who can pay a good price. As long as he is supplied with plenty of money it is to him a matter of comparative indifference whether the railways or the settlements he has to administer be in Austria or in Prussia."[1] Kühne, maintaining his official dignity, ignored the personal attacks of the South German agitator, and when replying in the *Staatszeitung* would deal only with matters of fact. In conversation, however, he was all the more acrimonious in his references to the Swabian's "absurdity and depravity," and to the crazy doings of the "absolutely mad Listian sinners." He was quite unable to realise that List's book contained new and fruitful ideas. The work seemed to him a mere rehash of ancient fallacies, and he considered it "extraordinary that this utterly futile and outworn mercantile system" could thus be revived.[2]

The great majority of North Germans held the same shortsighted view, and List's doctrine was welcomed by hardly anyone except the ironmasters of Westphalia and some of the

[1] Canitz, Observations upon Bunsen's Report of July 31, 1846.
[2] Kühne's Memoirs.

Silesian manufacturers. The owners of most of the older manufacturing enterprises considered themselves to be sufficiently protected by the existing duties, whilst the trading cities and the agricultural regions favoured free trade. Whereas in the south, protectionist views were looked upon as liberal, in the north-east, and especially in Old Prussia, the precisely opposite opinion prevailed, for here everyone who was a convinced liberal, everyone who favoured the enfranchising social legislation of the days of Stein and Hardenberg, was perforce an advocate of free trade. Even the landed gentry were in economic matters at one with their old adversaries the privy councillors. They had no reason to dread serious foreign competition as regards the fruits of the soil, and they therefore desired a low tariff, one that would facilitate consumption, and above all one that would provide them with cheap machinery, so that agricultural methods might undergo the greatly needed improvement. The half truth (in many instances wholly untrue) that the whole burden of a protective tariff falls upon the consumer, was still universally believed, and no one troubled to enquire why, if this were so, English producers should be so eager to advise against any increase in the German tariff upon yarn and iron. Vainly did Fritz Harkort, the popular Westphalian, explain to the landowners that the farmer of a Westphalian domain of a thousand acres used annually about twenty-four hundredweight of wrought iron and one hundredweight of steel. The utmost he would pay per acre on this account would be one silbergroschen, and therefore a moderate increase in the tariff on iron could not seriously affect him. Not until a much later date, when agriculture was threatened by the import of grain from other lands, did the German agriculturists begin to recognise that all branches of national industry, despite their mutual frictions, have a strong community of interests as against the foreign world. Such had ever been List's contention.

After the German manner, the doctrine of free competition was speedily transformed into a circumscribed system, and there soon came into existence a group of radical free traders who entered into association with Richard Cobden and the men of the Manchester school. Their leader was John Prince Smith, a noted Englishman who had settled in Prussia many years before. At Elbing he was on terms of close friendship with the sturdy liberal van Riesen, but his attitude towards

purely political questions was one of indifference. He wished to be a free trader and nothing more, cooperating with the liberals merely because he considered that he had a better chance of realising his economic ideals through their instrumentality. Narrow and self-assured, a typical Briton, he could see nothing in the world but trade and commerce; he was unceasingly occupied in the consideration of technical plans and improvements; the state was for him merely an agent which could safeguard economic security, and it was as such an agent that he frankly admired Prussia. It seemed to him self-evident that universal free trade would bring happiness to all nations, and would ultimately lead to the establishment of permanent peace, for once machines were everywhere at work no state could venture to make war for fear of a great commercial crisis. He diffused his views in numerous pamphlets, a doctrinaire with the foible of infallibility, but invariably displaying a moderate tone in controversy. Removing from Elbing to Berlin, he founded there a free trade union which was joined by many youthful enthusiasts.

This enthusiasm of the arid business understanding exercised a peculiar charm, and seemed positively alluring to German idealists. The doctrine of the unfettered development of all the economic energies had a specious resemblance to the æsthetic idealism of Wilhelm Humboldt, who in his *Æsthetical Essays*, an early work, had vigorously asserted the rights of the free individuality as against the coercive power of the state. Yet how seductive to noble minds was the sublime proposition that the just state can never allow itself to be misled by the class interests of egoistic manufacturers. All too soon was it to become plain how strongly the class interests of the mercantile community and the operators on the stock exchange cooperated in producing the doctrines of the free traders themselves. Abstract sanspatrie cosmopolitanism became more and more potent in the union. The radical talk of the free-traders-and-nothing-else of Berlin ultimately confirmed all that List had with much exaggeration formerly ascribed to "the school" of Adam Smith.

Berlin, unfortunately, was entirely devoid of the firm and confident will which alone could have held in leash such conspicuous party contrasts. The king perceived darkly that there was a certain justification for the southern protectionists' appeals. To the astonishment of his romanticist

friends, Frederick William had from early days displayed a remarkable understanding of economic issues. He had always distrusted the officialdom, and whilst still crown prince had frequently complained "that the mass of experience which has been accumulated by the traders and industrials among the public" was "quite unrepresented" in higher governmental circles.[1] On January 16, 1842, in accordance with his father's designs, he therefore founded the Territorial College of Economics, an advisory technical authority, which entered into relationships with the agricultural unions, appointed notable landlords as extraordinary members for the various provincial districts, and was thus in a position to deliver well-informed opinions concerning the state of agriculture. The king took whole-hearted delight in the first great industrial exhibition, organised by Beuth in the year 1844, and held in the Berlin arsenal. To commemorate the event he had a handsome medal struck, adorned with a picture of Germania, and bearing the inscription "Be United!" The repeated petitions from the provincial diets for the reestablishment of a ministry of commerce had convinced him that he could not continue to entrust industrial and commercial matters solely to the minister for finance and his advisers, swayed as these were apt to be by purely fiscal considerations.

When Bülow, who had now returned from London, recommended the foundation of a ministry for commerce modelled upon the British Board of Trade, the king was delighted with the idea. He believed himself to have found the right man to lead the new office in the person of Friedrich Ludwig von Rönne, a Holsteiner by birth, and minister resident in Washington. For a considerable period Rönne had been on furlough in Berlin. Warmly welcomed by Savigny, Bunsen, and Senfft von Pilsach (who remained, as ever, quietly at work), Rönne soon entered into close relationships with the monarch. In his diplomatic reports he had always furnished detailed accounts of economic affairs, and had done service to many German manufacturers by his valuable commercial reports. A man of stately appearance and amiable manners, he was a persona grata to the Americans. An enthusiastic admirer of the new king, he was no less enthusiastic in his desire to see a free Poland, and in his admiration for

[1] Thus does Frederick William relate the matter in a notice to the ministry of state, March, 1846.

the United States, whose federal constitution he desired to see imitated by Germany. It is not surprising that this man of ill-balanced enthusiasms should subsequently have strayed into the aberrant paths of a sterile liberal opposition. He was much impressed by List's protectionist theories, and was fond of talking to Bunsen, a kindred spirit, concerning German colonies and a pangerman mercantile marine—lofty designs whose only fault was that for the present they had no assured foundation. Though able and a man of many-sided culture, he was not even remotely comparable with Kühne, who was conspicuous for wide experience and for knowledge of affairs.

Since the simple course was ever the one which the king was least likely to follow, Frederick William could not make up his mind to revive the defunct ministry for commerce, as the provincial diets suggested. He was afraid, strangely enough, that this would "introduce difficulties into the course of the administration."[1] Influenced by a memorial from Rönne, he decided upon an unlucky half-measure. He wished to create a ministry for commerce under the presidency of Rönne. Like the Territorial College of Economics, it was merely to give technical opinions, to summon to its councils able merchants and manufacturers, and to enter into relationships with the chambers of commerce. Decisions regarding the opinions sent in by the ministry for commerce were to be made by the council for commerce, composed of five ministers and the president of the ministry for commerce. This council was to meet from time to time under the chairmanship of the monarch. The higher officials promptly realised that these changes foreshadowed an approximation to the protectionist system. Moreover, they were afraid that the ministry for commerce, like the audit office in former days, might tend to pass beyond the control of the ministers.[2] Bodelschwingh went so far as to consider that the appointment of economic "notables" implied the dangerous germs of a "constitutionalist representation." All the ministers vigorously opposed the design, Bülow alone taking the side of Rönne.[3] These remonstrances were disregarded, and on June 7, 1844, the council for commerce and the ministry for commerce were

[1] King Frederick William to Thile, August 27, 1843.

[2] Kühne's Memoirs.

[3] Thile's first plan, August, 1843; Thile's Report to the king, November 19, 1843; Bülow's Reports to the king, May 17, 1844.

legally inaugurated. The protectionists hailed the new ministry with cheerful anticipations;[1] but they were soon to learn that the king, with the best intentions in the world, had made a disastrous mistake. Since serious material oppositions had now been created, and since the advisory ministry for commerce lacked the secure footing possessed by the other ministries, which had active powers, there once more became apparent the old malady of the Prussian officialdom, and a violent war among the departments broke out. The hostility between the ministry for finance and the ministry for commerce was notorious; Rönne did not hesitate to incite the newspapers to attack Kühne; it was mockingly declared that Prussia's commercial policy was two-headed.

Since the first commercial treaty made by the customs union with a foreign power, the treaty with the Netherlands, had been a complete failure, and had been denounced after a brief period,[2] it was natural that henceforward the South Germans should have little confidence in Prussia's commercio-political negotiations. Their suspicion had been greatly increased when on March 2, 1841, Prussia had concluded a navigation treaty with England, for in the south England was justly regarded as the deadly enemy of German commercial unity. It was universally declared that this was the initial attempt to subject Germany utterly to the British, and to abolish our protective tariff. The *Allgemeine Zeitung* and almost all the journals of the south were infuriated. List wrathfully opined that every commercial treaty entered into by Prussia was a manifest disaster for the customs union. In reality this much abused treaty was of a perfectly innocent character, and was indeed positively beneficial to Germany. England promised that the ships of the customs union should in future be granted the advantages for the indirect voyages from the so-called "outer ports," from the North Sea harbours between the Elbe and the Rhine, which they had hitherto received only for direct voyages. The Prussian government had thus made a small step in the direction of national commercial unity, for in navigation affairs England had begun to treat Germany as a commercial unit. All that Prussia had accorded in return was the self-evident pledge that on her side, while

[1] Rönne to King Frederick William, February 16, 1850.
[2] See vol. VI, p. 96.

the treaty was in force, she would make no changes in her navigation laws, which were far more liberal than the English navigation act and made no distinction between direct and indirect voyages. The foolish clamour raised about this affair served only to prove how intense was the strife of faction within the customs union. King Frederick William hesitated for a moment, but then asked Kühne's advice and permitted himself to be convinced.[1] The pugnacious general tax director thereupon published in the *Staatszeitung* a justification of the English treaty—a luminous essay which reduced his opponents to silence.

Far more important were the tedious customs negotiations with Belgium. A grave political danger had here to be averted, if needs must by economic sacrifices. A considerable while back King Leopold had made cautious enquiries in Berlin as to whether Belgium could not enter the customs union, and had been informed that the union must remain a purely German commercial league.[2] It soon became apparent that the enquiry had been a diplomatic trap, for had the Prussian government acceded to a request that was not seriously meant, it would have lost the right to offer any objection in the future to a Franco-Belgian customs union. This latter undertaking, so threatening to Germany, was actually in its inception during the summer of 1841, for information was received from London that the Brussels court had proposed to Paris the formation of a customs union modelled upon that of Germany.[3] As the king of Würtemberg soon learned from a trustworthy source,[4] the proposal emanated from Leopold in person. Guizot could not reject it off-hand, for the annexation of Belgium remained the dream of every Frenchman, while all the neighbouring powers contemplated with jealousy the successes of the Prussian customs union policy. Fortunately, however, many of the French manufacturers dreaded Belgian competition, and their opposition rendered the negotiations difficult.

The neutrality of Belgium had been guaranteed by all the powers, and if the Brussels court were to observe this neutrality scrupulously Belgium could not enter into a customs

[1] Kühne's Memoirs.
[2] This incident is mentioned by Bunsen in his Report of February 28, 1843.
[3] Schleinitz, Report, London, July 27, 1841.
[4] Rochow's Report, Stuttgart, January 19, 1843.

union with any of the great powers. Least of all could she enter into such a union with France, for in the days of the continental system Europe had had ample experience of what it signified to have French customs officials in foreign countries. The shrewd Coburger could not possibly fail to be aware of this manifest truth. If he brought forward the impossible idea of a Belgo-French customs union, it was plainly his design, after prolonged vacillations, to secure in the end favourable commercial treaties from both his neighbours. Belgium, lying between Germany and France, had her main trade with the latter country, but her most valuable products went to Germany. This crafty commercial intrigue continued for fully three years, so that nearly half of Bunsen's reports were devoted to the matter. Sometimes Leopold had recourse to threats, and he went so far as to say on one occasion: "I do not shrink from war with the eastern powers, which have treated me so badly. In this event I should throw myself into the arms of France."[1]

The Prussian government, the one most intimately concerned, did all that was possible to counteract these machinations. In a difficult situation Frederick William was always glad to turn to Europe as a whole, and he therefore demanded that the guarantors of Belgian neutrality should hold a conference and should issue a joint declaration to the effect that a neutral state could not enter into a customs union with any foreign power. But Prussia was to learn once more how little value could be attached to a European joint guarantee. Every one of the powers tried to hide behind the others; every one of them was afraid to issue a formal declaration which might have caused embarrassment to the Guizot ministry and might thus have once more endangered the peace of Europe. On principle they agreed with Prussia, but they would hear nothing of a conference, and even Nesselrode was lukewarm in the matter.[2] Metternich sent a sharply worded despatch to the Austrian representative in Paris, and subsequently, with his wonted self-approval, boasted to the Prussian envoy: "I have given the death blow to this plan."[3] But the plan remained alive for a considerable time, and Metternich

[1] Bunsen's Report, November 11, 1842.

[2] Liebermann's Reports, December 27, 1842, January 11, 1843, and subsequent dates.

[3] Canitz' Report, December 8, 1842.

did nothing further. Aberdeen overfloweed with friendly assurances, declaring that he had several times warned the king of the Belgians both orally and in writing. In case of need he would participate in a joint declaration from the four powers to the court of the Tuileries, but at the moment the need for such a step seemed to him "less obvious."[1] Lord Aberdeen was a personal friend of Guizot. An observer less prejudiced than Bunsen could have seen readily enough that neither England nor Austria could seriously aim at anything which might support the policy of the German customs union. To all the powers the menace of a strong Central Europe was equally alarming.

The Prussian state, therefore, had to rely upon her own energies, and in the existing posture of affairs there was but one means of preventing the formation of a Belgo-French customs union. It was necessary for Prussia to offer the Belgians a commercial treaty which would make it impossible for them to accept the French customs system. With this end in view, protracted negotiations were begun in Brussels. The course of these negotiations showed that King Leopold and his able minister Nothomb were utilising the bogey of the French customs union chiefly in order to put pressure upon Germany. At the outset of the proceedings Leopold conveyed a fervent assurance to his nephew at Windsor that the French plan had been completely abandoned. But subsequently, when the affair was at a standstill, and when Prussia had found it necessary to meet the attacks of her little neighbour by the imposition of high retaliatory duties, the idea of the French customs union was suddenly revived.[2] The Coburg ruler played his cards skilfully; it was far from easy to see his game; and since he could count upon help from France, Prussia was in a difficult diplomatic situation.

Baron Heinrich von Arnim, one of the romanticist friends of the king's youth, was envoy in Brussels. In former days he had delighted the drawing rooms of the Wilhelmstrasse by his ingelligence and his wit and by his eloquent defence of the Hallerian doctrine of the state; of late years, however, taught by experience, he had adopted more liberal views.

[1] Bunsen's Reports, July 12 and December 6, 1842; Aberdeen to Bunsen, May 24, 1843.

[2] Bunsen's Report, London, July 17, 1843; Thile junior's Report, London, April 19, 1844.

He continued to cherish grand ideas concerning the future power and glory of Germany. Being no less ambitious than able, he was ever on the alert as he moved in society, whilst keeping on terms also with the world of scholars, and gifted young men found his amiable and stimulating personality irresistibly attractive. Unfortunately he was not free from fantastical and almost foolish tendencies, which were manifested in his fondness for hazy speculations in natural philosophy and in strict pietism, whilst at times these whimsies were politically dangerous. Arnim delighted in visiting seaports and factories, saying proudly: "Political economy is my speciality."[1] Yet his knowledge of economics was merely that of a cultured dilettante. His views resembled those of Rönne, and he was on friendly terms with List, who came to Brussels on one occasion to participate in the negotiations. Arnim openly declared to Minister Nothomb that on political grounds an understanding was essential to Prussia. After prolonged labours, he was able to arrange a commercial treaty, which was signed on September 1, 1844. Belgium secured a reduction in the German duties on iron, this being an important advantage for the Walloon provinces, which had hitherto been on terms of enmity with their German neighbours. The customs union secured in return the comforting certainty that, as long as the treaty was in force, Belgium could not enter any customs union, whilst the right of tariff-free transit upon the Aix-Antwerp railway was reaffirmed. Germany therefore did not gain any direct economic advantage. Not merely did the preference given to Belgian iron conflict with the principles of the customs union, which had not heretofore granted any differential tariffs, but, further, this preference was injurious to the German mines, which were ill able to meet the competition of the older and wealthier ironworks of Belgium. King Leopold had again displayed his mercantile astuteness, and when in 1845 he concluded a favourable commercial treaty with France as well, he had good ground for congratulating himself upon the rich returns from his policy of vacillation.

The great expectations which Arnim had based upon the tariff-free transit trade with Antwerp were not fulfilled. He had hoped that commerce upon the Scheldt would flourish once more as it had flourished in those distant days when

[1] Arnim to Canitz, June 9, 1847.

the Hanseats had built their great German House overlooking the harbour. Antwerp was to become the emporium of the German west, was to divert the Rhenish trade from Holland, and was thus ultimately to compel the Hansa towns to join the customs union. He developed these ideas in an able memorial entitled *A Commercio-Political Testament.* Twelve copies only were printed, and it was bepraised by all the protectionist journals, though few of them had seen it. Arnim's ultimate hope was for the establishment of a German system of preferential tariffs, though this was absolutely unrealisable in the absence of a coercive imperial authority and without the co-operation of the Hansa towns. Moreover, unless Germany were to have attacked Dutch commerce by severe differential duties, which would have been injurious to our own Rhineland, it would have been impossible to divert the greater part of the Rhenish trade to the Scheldt. To sum up, the Belgian treaty brought no direct advantage to the customs union, but the envoy, none the less, received cordial praise from the Prussian court. He deserved this commendation even though his action had been somewhat too independent. Political necessity excuses much, and it was absolutely essential to prevent the union of Belgium with the French customs system. This was plain to the other courts in the customs union ; they had been notified in advance by the Prussian government that the commercial treaty could be secured in no other way than by a preference for Belgian iron, and they approved the compact when it had been signed. King Louis, above all, was delighted that his beloved customs union had been saved from grave peril. Fortunately the South German protectionists were not difficult to appease. Although the treaty conflicted with their principles, they praised it—for List had helped to bring it about.

Whilst Prussia's commercial policy was checked in its free development by this petty western neighbour, that policy was seriously embarrassed in the east. Since 1836, when the late king had refused to enter into a new commercial treaty with a neighbour who did not regard treaties as binding, both Prussia and Russia had acted quite arbitrarily on the frontier. As King Frederick William now phrased it, "a state of affairs most unusual between two friendly neighbour

peoples" had come into existence.[1] During the opening years of his reign, Czar Nicholas had been hardly less suspicious of the nationalist ideas of the Muscovites than he was suspicious of liberalism, for the decabrist leaders who had entered into a conspiracy against his throne had belonged almost without exception to the old nobility. But after the complete suppression of the Polish revolt, he inclined more and more towards the views of the Muscovite party, views which were in any case accordant with his own rude detestation of culture. He desired to exclude from Holy Russia the ideas no less than the wares of the corrupt west. Speaking openly to Rauch, his Prussian confidant, the czar said: "I must keep the frontier closed, lest the Polish refugees should bring their revolutionary poison into the country."[2] Subjugated Poland was treated to all intents and purposes as if it had been a Russian province, while the first onslaughts upon the ancient territorial privileges of the Baltic provinces were now beginning. In this semi-oriental world, where religion binds men together even more firmly than does the state, it was a terrible blow to the Lutheran Germanism of the Baltic regions that thousands of Esthonian and Lettish peasants should now be attracted into the Orthodox fold by alluring promises, and that within a few years twenty Greek churches should be built upon the crown domains. The new factories artificially called into being by Cancrin's prohibitive system had for the most part been founded in Moscow, and the centre of gravity of the empire was moving southward. A new age was heralded, and the civilising work of Peter the Great was threatened with destruction. Unity of speech, of law, and of creed, beneath the sceptre of the white czar—such was the new watchword, and it was one which indubitably expressed the sentiments of the ruling classes.

In the century of nationalist ideas and principles the cruel law of historical ingratitude under whose working almost all the civilised nations have suffered, could not fail to display its force, and chiefly to Germany's detriment. Just as the Germans long ago, as yet hardly mature, had expelled the Romans, the teachers who had brought them civilisation, so in the sixteenth century had their own pupils, the Scandinavian peoples, defiantly declared themselves of age and insisted upon

[1] Cabinet Order to Bülow, June 7, 1842.
[2] Rauch's Report to the king, December 8, 1842.

beginning an independent national life. Now had come the day when the entire subgerman world of the east, which owed its civilisation almost exclusively to the Germans, was attempting to dispense with its Teutonic mentors. It was but a natural development that the waxing national pride of the Magyars and the Czechs, of the Russians and the South Slavs, should manifest itself as a virulent germanophobia. Panslavist ideas, fantastic dreams of a union of all the Slav nations under the rule of the white czar, were already making headway in Russia. Consequently the Russian nobles were now enthusiastically advocating an alliance with France, and this idea, which had been voiced more than once during the reign of Alexander I, at length secured ardent supporters in France as well. People began to recall the days when Pozzo di Borgo, Russian envoy and French patriot, had been adviser to the court of the Tuileries. Lamartine, whose extravagant speeches conveyed at times prophetic disclosures of the hidden sentiments of his nation, termed the Franco-Russian alliance "the cry of nature," and spoke of it as "a geographical necessity."

In their emotional life nations resemble individual human beings far more closely than the flatterers of democracy are willing to admit, for nations, like individuals, are apt to be bewitched by fixed ideas, to be ruled for lengthy periods by hazy and illusory conceptions. There was no real community of interests between Russia and France. Once only, during the Seven Years' War, had they joined in the fight against Germany, and had done so little to their renown. It was nothing but the hatred for a strengthening Central Europe which now led to the revival of the notion of a Franco-Russian alliance, but since this feeling of hatred prevailed so widely both in the west and in the east, a day could well be foreseen when the unwholesome political design might be realised. Nicholas, it is true, was not inclined to follow the Muscovites to such an extreme. He still held as strongly to the league of the eastern powers as did his trusted advisers Nesselrode and Orloff, and the czar never completely abandoned his loathing for the July monarchy or his long-standing admiration for the Prussian army. For these reasons the panslavists spoke slightingly of him as "a German Gottorp," and dubbed him "Carl Ivanovitch," the use of the nickname carrying with it the advantage that under this cloak they could abuse the czar with impunity, just as the young radicals of Prussia

could mock at "Lehmann." But as far as the home affairs of Russia were concerned, Muscovitism, with its barbaric hatred of foreigners, was absolutely dominant.

As years passed, however, the disorder on the frontier became troublesome to the Russians themselves. Passing through Berlin at the opening of the new reign, Cancrin intimated his desire for a new commercial treaty, and he subsequently approached the Prussian envoy most courteously with the same end in view. An opportunity for negotiations was not slow to present itself, for the agreement relating to the extradition of the refugees lapsed in the year 1842. This agreement was of priceless value to Russia, for the serf soldiers frequently attempted to desert to Prussia. For Prussia, on the other hand, the agreement was extremely inconvenient, for there were practically no Prussian refugees, while the Russian refugees, as soon as they had eluded the scrutiny of the frontier authorities, being excellent agricultural labourers, were far from unwelcome to the landowners of Posen and East Prussia. If, therefore, the court of Berlin was none the less prepared to consider the renewal of the agreement, it was entitled, in return for this proof of neighbourliness, to request facilitations of trade across the frontier and to expect certain mitigations of tariff. Indeed, the eastern provinces were clamouring for measures of this kind. Early in 1842, therefore, negotiations were opened, and the agreement was provisionally renewed for no more than six months.[1]

In June the king of Prussia visited St. Petersburg,[2] and the czar prepared for his guest an oriental surprise, such as would have been hardly possible in a western land. He declared that from pure friendship for the king he would at once facilitate frontier trade as Prussia desired, would establish several new frontier offices, and would reduce the tariff upon various Prussian goods, upon silk, cotton, and iron. These concessions were to be immediately promulgated in a ukase. He asked for nothing in exchange, being prepared to leave the renewal of the agreement and the reduction of the transit dues on Russian grain "to the king's sense of justice and friendly feelings," in which he had perfect confidence. This crafty proceeding might well have attained

[1] Report to the king from Boyen, Bülow, Rochow, and Werther, March 8, 1842.

[2] See vol. VI, p. 500.

its end in view of Frederick William's unsuspecting magnanimity, but fortunately the king was accompanied by two sober-minded and experienced negotiators, Cabinet Councillors Uhden and Müller. Their warnings were urgent, while the officials in Berlin promptly realised the czar's aims. As General Thile wrote, Nicholas reckoned "that the appearance of spontaneous generosity would be most likely to enable him to avoid the necessity of further negotiations and to arrange the conditions of the new understanding to suit his own book."[1]

Following the usual practice among civilised states, the Prussian government therefore treated the czar's concessions as no more than proposals, and demanded in addition certain other concessions.[2] Nicholas was furious. Intensely annoyed that his manœuvres had been understood, he raged against the ingratitude of the Prussians. Within a few weeks the court of Berlin gained a yet closer acquaintance with the value of Russian generosity, for when the promised ukase appeared it transpired that the reductions of tariff were expressly reserved for Prussian goods, and since these reductions did not apply to the goods of the customs union in general it would be impossible for Prussia to accept them. It was true that hitherto the customs union had allowed Prussia, as the only customs union state whose frontier marched with that of Russia, to conduct single-handed necessary negotiations with the eastern empire. But since within the union trade was perfectly free, all advantages granted to Prussian exports must necessarily accrue to every member of the customs union, just as all goods imported from Russia were available on the same terms throughout the German customs area directly they had crossed the Prussian frontier. Apart from this, the authorities were no longer in a position to provide for goods exported to Russia guaranteed certificates of Prussian origin. It was impossible that a statesman so well-informed as Cancrin could fail to be aware of these circumstances. It was his friendly design to extort further advantages from Prussia, and doubtless at the same time to arouse discord among the members of the customs union.

In actual fact, immediately the ukase was promulgated, a violent outcry was raised against Prussia's faithlessness and

[1] Thile's Report to the king, September 22, 1842.
[2] Bülow, Instruction to Rauch, August 20, 1842.

self-seeking. This was another wholly unjustified reproach against the leading power in the customs union. The Prussian court had never entertained a thought of sacrificing its allies, and its immediate answer to Russia was to the effect that the Russian concessions could not be accepted unless they were to be shared by all the members of the customs union. This response, inevitable though it was, was received by Cancrin with such well-simulated indignation and astonishment that King Frederick William was greatly enraged at the Russified German's hypocrisy, and wrote: "I should like to address him with the closing words of Götz von Berlichingen to the imperial trumpeter!!! This *sometime German* has now become a *fully-fledged Russian.*"[1] Nesselrode now pompously declared that the czar "did not hesitate to denounce the agreement, and thus to add a sacrifice to all those he had previously and so willingly made."[2] For several months thenceforward the neighbour states had no treaty relationships, Prussia contenting herself with the extradition of common criminals.[3] Nor was the prince of Prussia able to do anything when visiting his Russian brother-in-law in December. The czar stormed and raged, and in his fury adopted preposterous plans for defence, commanding that all Jews should withdraw to a minimum distance of fifty versts from the frontier, and actually proposing to lay waste a strip of land one kilometre wide for the whole length of the frontier, in order to prevent smuggling and the passage of refugees.[4] To Liebermann, the envoy, a disputatious and tactless man, whose methods were little likely to assuage the czar's wrath, Nicholas showed his ill-humour very plainly. To the faithful Rauch he bitterly declared that the russophobia which prevailed throughout Germany made it quite impossible for him to manifest any friendship towards the customs union.[5]

Nicholas came to feel in the end that such defiance would lead nowhere. Negotiations were resumed, and the Prussian government discovered an expedient which would enable the czar to withdraw without any formal recantation.

[1] Marginal Notes to Bülow's Despatch to Thile under date March 9, 1843.

[2] Nesselrode to Fonton, charge d'affaires in Berlin, August 31, 1842.

[3] Instruction from the minister for home affairs to Lord Lieutenant Bötticher, November 16; Cabinet Order to Boyen, Bülow, and Arnim, November 23, 1842.

[4] Count Arnim's Reports to the king, July 19 and August 10, 1843.

[5] Liebermann's Reports, November 14 and December 20; Rauch's Report, December 30, 1842.

Liebermann had to propose, not that Nicholas should repeal his ukase, but that he should merely issue an order that Prussian certificates of origin would be valid if they contained a simple assurance that the goods for export to Russia were obtained by free trade in the interior—this signifying that they were customs union goods. Cancrin rejoined with a pride of conscious virtue which had a droll aspect in a Russian: "Your proposal is somewhat Jesuitical."[1] Nevertheless, he recognised before long that this immoral proposal would serve to build him a golden bridge. In September, 1843, Nicholas visited Prussia, and was delighted at the manœuvres to see two army corps and seventeen cavalry regiments wearing the fine new helmets and tunics. The opportunity was seized for further negotiations concerning trade across the frontier,[2] and at length, in January, 1844, the czar approved Prussia's demand for a more liberal wording of certificates of origin, and thus, without any formal declaration of the fact, all goods from the customs union were placed upon an equal footing with the Prussian. Now that Prussia had gained her immediate end, the king wrote tenderly to his brother-in-law as follows: "You have done a great and good deed in arranging for the new form of certificates of origin for those goods which, as an outcome of the benefits you granted in the previous year, can now cross your frontiers. In view of what has happened, it is no longer necessary for me to renounce these benefits for my subjects. Moreover your position towards Germany, dearest friend, is now different, is now good, is what it ought to be. Many things which I could not venture to do last year, because they conflicted with a public opinion which I felt bound to respect, can be done now, when the opposition of the public is no longer worthy of respect, and will therefore no longer be respected by me."[3] Progress was henceforward more rapid. Prussia reduced the transit dues upon Rusian grain passing down the rivers, and renewed the lapsed agreement on May 20, 1844.

Even in these concluding negotiations the Muscovites did not fail to provide some pleasant surprises. The czar had just issued a decree to the effect that all Russian Jews who should leave the empire without a passport would ipso facto

[1] Liebermann's Report, April 21, 1843.
[2] Bülow, Circular Despatch to the embassies, September 20, 1843.
[3] King Frederick William to Czar Nicholas, February 4, 1844.

be legally deprived of their Russian nationality, and he now innocently demanded that in the agreement Prussia should recognise the legal validity of this ordinance. This would enable Russia, in accordance with her well-tried administrative principles, to shunt upon Prussia the least desirable members of her Jewish community. But the Prussians declined to give this additional proof of friendliness, and the agreement contained no reference to the Jews.

Prussia had small reason to congratulate herself upon the net result of the affair. The Russian concessions amounted to very little, whilst in return for them it was necessary to resume the burdensome duties imposed upon us in the agreement in favour of a semi-Asiatic power. These obligations had to be discharged by the Prussian state alone, but for Germany's sake the king accepted the sacrifice, so that he might secure equality of rights for his allies in the customs union. Yet this splendid proof of loyalty to Germany was never accounted to his credit by the protectionist journals of the south, which continued to lavish invectives. None the less, intercourse on the Russian frontier assumed a more tolerable complexion during the next few years, and even better prospects seemed to open when Cancrin resigned, and died shortly afterwards (1845). Everyone hoped that the detested prohibitive system would fall with the retirement of its powerful originator. Tengoborski, the leading expert in Russian economics, who definitely demanded the reduction of the high tariff, was now frequently consulted by Nesselrode. Nicholas would at times express sympathy with this idea, riding to parade with General Rochow, the new envoy, a military man and an ultra-conservative, and therefore much more a persona grata to the czar than Liebermann had been. But these good intentions though there was more in them than mere talk, proved sterile. The old system remained in force, for the czar could not make up his mind to appoint a competent financier as Cancrin's successor; and the members of the leading families at court, being directly interested in the new factories, opposed every suggestion of reform.[1] Privy Councillor von Patow, after prolonged consultation with Kühne, came to the conclusion that a commercial treaty between Prussia and Russia was out of the question, because Russia would make no concessions, or could not be relied upon to hold to her undertakings.

[1] Rochow's Reports, November 11, 1845, September 24 and November 4, 1846.

"As Sir Robert Peel says, and in part because he says so," wrote Patow, "the day for commercial treaties is over."[1]

Prussia's commercial policy vis-à-vis the other foreign powers was equally unsuccessful. A commercial treaty with the United States, which had been agreed upon between negotiators, was rejected by congress. Prolonged and acrimonious negotiations with Denmark achieved in the end no more than a moderate reduction of the Sound dues, for neither England, nor Russia, nor Sweden gave effective support to Prussia. Our Hansa kinsmen hailed with clamorous delight the ill success of their competitors in the Baltic.

It was inevitable that these failures abroad should increase the intensity of the struggle between the economic factions at home. The customs union had now to sustain its ordeal by fire. All the crises through which, subsequently to this one, the union had to pass, were occasioned, or at any rate favoured, by the political arrières pensées of the middle-sized states, which were ever directing their eyes towards Austria. But this first crisis, the severest, came from the people. Unquestionably Abel and his ultramontane associates would have been delighted to destroy the national commercial league, and they were actually successful in securing the dismissal of General Tax Director Bever, a favourite in Prussia. But King Louis would not allow Abel to push his designs further. Despite clericalist dreams, the Wittelsbach sovereign remained a good German. Conciliatory throughout, the king declared to the Prussian chargé d'affaires: "The customs union is indestructible, and is far more important than the Germanic Federation."[2] Nor did the other courts entertain hostile designs; they were merely carried away by the impetuous desires of the manufacturers. A breach between north and south seemed imminent. All the North German customs allies and Hesse-Darmstadt sided with Prussia, whilst the protectionist group comprised Baden, Würtemberg, Nassau, and Bavaria, the last-named power walking more cautiously than the others.

Unfortunately matters were less simple than Bodelschwingh assumed when he confidently said that the cry for a high protective tariff was artificial, and that the majority of the population was well content with the low tariff and the flourish-

[1] Patow to Canitz, January 21, 1847.
[2] Küster's Report, December 18, 1843.

ing finances.[1] It was indisputable that the old tariff, though speaking generally it was still all that could be desired, was injurious to certain branches of industry. The linen manufacture of Silesia, once so flourishing, was the chief sufferer. In former days the corveable peasants had spun the flax of the lords of the manor into linen yarn. Since the abolition of the corvée the culture of flax had declined. A thrifty endeavour was made to secure linseed and flax from the same crop, a barely possible achievement. The flax obtained by this method was of inferior quality, and the unlucky weavers, laboriously working the material upon their old-fashioned looms, were compelled to meet the vigorous competition of English machinofacture. During Napoleonic days, British industry, protected by a high tariff, had undergone a marvellous expansion, and had taken advantage of all the latest mechanical discoveries. When the Prussian customs law was first passed, the German linen industry was still supreme in the home market, and the tariff then introduced was adequate for a time. But ere long there was a change in the picture. Exports from Germany declined by fully two-thirds, whilst imports from England continually increased, the import of linen yarn alone increasing more than threefold (from 19,000 to 62,000 cwt.) during the five year period 1840–1844.

Throughout these changes the government remained inactive. For a long time the belief in the invincibility of Silesian linen goods persisted, and when the erroneous nature of this opinion was at length realised, the privy councillors indifferently declared that it was hopeless to fight against the natural laws of political economy. Yet here was the very place for far-reaching state aid, in this impoverished population, whose will power had been undermined by Frederician tutelage. Unless these half starving men were to be utterly vanquished by English capital, it was essential for the state to impose protective duties, to purchase machinery, to establish spinning schools and great spinning mills. Lord Lieutenant Merckel, unrestingly working for the benefit of Silesia, had for years been endeavouring to carry out the new agrarian laws in face of the opposition of the landlords. But Merckel, for all his efficiency, had never got beyond the emancipative ideas of the Hardenberg era, so that freedom of property and the enfranchisement of labour power remained his supreme ideals.

[1] Bodelschwingh's Opinion, November 19, 1843.

Silesian home industry had long been free, and had indeed never been subjected to the coercion of the guilds. Merckel was quite unable to realise the urgent need for state help in this region, and he would not hear a word of the distress in the Riesengebirge. Blinded by economic theory he failed in his duties as a statesman. Like so many of the best among his colleagues, he failed tragically because when the right moment came he was unable to perceive that in this century of economic transformations the liberating state authority must know also how to constrain and how to protect. The unfavourable condition of the world market and the government's persistent sins of omission had by now worked so disastrously upon the Silesian linen industry that sufficient help could hardly be expected from a protective tariff alone.

The cotton spinning industries of the south, of recent foundation, and often established with scant foresight, were likewise clamouring for further protection, whereas to the cotton weavers the existing duty on cotton twist (6% ad valorem) seemed much too high. Thus originated the prolonged and fierce struggle between the spinners and the weavers. Each of the allied courts endeavoured, reasonably enough, to favour the interests that were locally preponderant. The Saxon government led the free trade party, for the great cotton weaving enterprises of the Erzgebirge were almost entirely dependent upon England for their supplies of cotton yarn. The Prussian ministry for finance was straightforward in its endeavours to do impartial justice to these two hostile interests, and ultimately decided against raising the duty on yarn, for, according to Kühne's calculations, in the customs union territory considered as a whole far more labour was employed in weaving than in spinning. But the living forces of the national economy cannot be estimated in this purely mechanical manner, cannot be reckoned in figures alone. The demands of the spinners, howerer extreme, were not entirely without justification. An increased duty on yarn would doubtless be disadvantageous to the weavers for a time, but in the long run they could not fail to gain from being able to secure their supplies of yarn from the German spinning mills, which would flourish under the new tariff.

Hardly less loud were the complaints from the representatives of the iron industry. Since the beginning of railway construction there had been an enormous increase in demand,

and inasmuch as the German ironworks, which had not as yet begun to use coke for smelting purposes, could not possibly cope with this demand, and the import of pig-iron, rails, and wrought-iron increased tenfold during the decade 1834 to 1843, rising from 18,000 to 180,000 tons. The competition of England, a country whose ironworks and coal-mines are in convenient proximity, grew serious in the early forties, when the English iron industry, affected by a crisis, began to dump its products upon the continent in vast quantities. In many cases English iron was brought as ballast to Stettin or Hamburg, and was then carried cheaply inland along the rivers. It was natural that the Silesian and some of the Westphalian mining corporations should petition the king urgently for protection.[1] But a similar conflict of interests was here manifest as in the struggle between the spinners and the weavers. By the year 1843, no less than 180,000 tons of foreign pig-iron was imported for use by the members of the customs union, though six years earlier the import had been no more than 20,000 tons. The owners of the great works on the Ruhr, those chiefly interested in this rapidly growing industry, were as decisively opposed to any duty on pig-iron as were the innumerable petty scissor-makers and swordsmiths of Berg.

The protectionist party directed its first attacks against these weak spots in the customs union tariff. Should they succeed here, they hoped to go further. One of the hotspurs of the movement, Moritz Mohl, the man who had displayed his ferocious hatred for Prussia in the days when the customs union had been founded,[2] penned at this juncture a learned work dealing with French industrial conditions and extolling the rigid prohibitive system. Feeling ran high in the south. Even Nebenius, usually so cautious, wrote a pamphlet in which he demanded a quite immoderate tariff upon iron. When the customs conference met at Stuttgart in the summer of 1842, Würtemberg and Bavaria promptly demanded various increases in the tariff, but a unanimous decision proved impossible to secure. The existing tariff consequently remained in force. The assembly broke up in ill-humour, for the old and splendid harmony of the commercial league seemed to have been destroyed. Anger was now so intense in South Germany

[1] King Frederick William to Thile, February 20, 1842.

[2] See vol. V, pp. 444, et seq.

that the financial party in Berlin became alarmed for the very existence of the customs union, and resolved to make certain concessions.[1] After further negotiations of an extremely troublesome character, in 1844 the customs union agreed upon modifications in its tariff. Pig-iron, hitherto duty-free, was to pay henceforward ten silbergroschen per cwt., while the duty upon bar-iron, iron rails, and wrought-iron, and also upon linen twist, were increased. The imports of iron promptly diminished, but the effect of the new duties was less pronounced than the mine owners had hoped, for shortly after the change in the tariff Germany was compelled to give the Belgians the preference of which mention has already been made.

The protectionist party was encouraged by this partial victory to make further attacks. The protectionist press became more violent day by day, and did not shrink from the use of revolutionary threats. In a meeting of Badenese manufacturers held at Carlsruhe, Gottschalck, the radical deputy of Schopfheim, declared that if the customs union would not grant further protection, all that would be necessary would be for the manufacturers to dismiss their workmen, and to leave it to these to see that the employers' wishes were carried out![2] "Let us leave the customs union and join Austria!" Such was the universal cry of blind leaders who no longer knew what they were saying. Cotta's *Allgemeine Zeitung* published as a horrible revelation a letter which it had somehow got hold of—written by Lord Westmoreland, British envoy in Berlin. The English peer did no more than relate that the Prussian ministers had expounded to him with somewhat excessive cordiality their moderate commercial principles. This was merely the small change of diplomatic intercourse, but so obnoxious an interpretation was put upon it by List and his followers, that they actually considered it proved that Prussia marched under England's orders. All the traditional faults of German contentiousness were once more displayed.

Meanwhile the Prussian ministry for commerce had been founded, and Rönne, who counted on the monarch's favour, promptly declared open war on the financial party. Without even consulting the ministry for finance,[3] in the spring of 1845

[1] Memorial from the ministry for finance, January 5; Küster's Report, Munich, January 21, 1844.

[2] Radowitz' Report, June 28, 1845.

[3] Kühne's Memoirs.

he summoned a meeting of economic notables, who were protectionists almost without exception, and consequently voted for an increase in the tariff. On the other hand, the radical opponents of protection armed for defence. Prince Smith dedicated to the approaching customs conference a little work which condemned all protectionist duties alike, summing them up as "price-raising duties." The East Prussian diet expressed similar views, but the king's speech when the diet was dismissed called the estates' serious attention to the consideration that by the terms of the old customs law the crown was pledged to protect domestic industries. Frederick William was earnestly desirous to show equal justice towards all interests. He tormented himself with conscientious scruples, but where could he find an issue from this turmoil of the factions. Flottwell, the new minister for finance, like almost all the East Prussians of that day, was a rigid free trader; all that Kühne desired was that in case of need there should be an increase in a few items of the present moderate tariff; and both Flottwell and Kühne were supported by Rönne, radical and protectionist.

It was under such gloomy auspices that the Carlsruhe customs conference opened in July, 1845, and the assembly proved the stormiest in the history of the customs union. It lasted nearly four months, and matters went continually from bad to worse. A number of foreign agents were at work, the English in especial lobbying the plenipotentiaries so assiduously that venomous backbiting was inevitable. For peace' sake Prussia declared herself ready to double or nearly to double the duties upon linen, cotton, and worsted yarns. Just before the opening of the conference the king had summoned his new commercial adviser to Stettin, and had asked how far it was possible to meet south German desires.[1] Baden and Würtemberg, however, were carried away by the impetuosity of their protectionists, although they knew that Saxony and most of the other North German allies thought that Prussia had already conceded too much. Demanding more, they ended by saying, All or nothing! It was their fault, and theirs alone, that no decision was reached and that the conference broke up amid fierce dissensions. The more thoughtful advocates of national commercial unity felt that they had sustained a serious defeat. The radical free traders

[1] King Frederick William to Thile, July 8, 1845.

and the foreigners exulted, and Sir A. Malet, the English envoy, actually had the impudence to invite the members of the conference to a banquet in celebration of the victory. But Radowitz intervened to prevent this, and the attempt was subsequently referred to by the Prussian court as a gross piece of presumption.[1]

The enraged protectionists now raised their war-cry anew, and more loudly than ever. In the chamber at Stuttgart, Metternich's excise officers were acclaimed as Germany's natural protectors, while the Prussians were stigmatised as England's train-bearers. Yet Aberdeen was continually complaining to Bunsen that commercial relationships were the only things at issue between England and Prussia,[2] while during these very days a despatch from Aberdeen to Westmoreland became known wherein angry references were made to Prussia's hostile commercial policy. Neuffer, a Bavarian deputy, referred in the Munich diet to the old commercial slavery of the Germans, which had now been reestablished through Prussia's fault. The pressmen of List's party could find no phrases strong enough to describe the stupidity and badness of the German "bureaucracy." But this very excess of unmeaning invectives compelled the bureaucrats, who were, after all, the rulers of the customs union, to join hands once more. When Prussia sent her allies a serious enquiry, asking them whether the customs union was to continue to exist, all the governments returned conciliatory answers. An excellent writing by Kühne, describing the development of the customs union since 1834, gave the general public an idea of what Germany owed to her commercial union. An understanding was gradually secured, and when the customs conference reassembled in Berlin during the summer of 1846 Canitz sarcastically opined that the intoxication of Carlsruhe had been slept off. The protectionists had however to pay for their noisy arrogance. Rönne, whose indiscretions had certainly increased the disorders, was now cold-shouldered everywhere; he begged leave to resign, but the king refused to accept the resignation. The new proposals for a compromise, ably defended at the conference by Privy Councillor von Patow, offered the protectionists somewhat less than they had been offered at Carlsruhe. It was the old story of the sibylline

[1] Canitz, Instruction to Radowitz, October 10, 1844.
[2] Bunsen's Reports, March 26, 1844, and subsequent dates.

books. An agreement was secured for an increased duty on yarn, though the increase was far less than the protectionists desired. But the governments drew a breath of relief, and their satisfaction was shared by the great majority of the nation, for now that the customs union had successfully overcome this danger, its existence was safeguarded for a long time to come. Moreover, graver political struggles were soon to divert the eyes of the world from these tariff disputes.

The Hofburg, by its incompetence, had involuntarily contributed to the reconciliation of the allies in the customs union. The fanatical protectionists of South Germany were incessantly demanding an Austrian customs union, and although with some this was mere vaunting, with others the demand conveyed a definite threat. Since the Cologne episcopal dispute, an Austrian Great German party had been quietly forming in the south.[1] It had three main groups of supporters, the most important of these being the clericalists; next came the prussophobe protectionists; while the third group was composed of persons belonging to families which had long monopolised the chief preferments in the cathedral cities, persons who looked back regretfully to the glorious days of the prince-bishops, and whose sons for the most part entered Austrian service. Not until the party became well-established was it joined by a certain number of the democrats. List would not go to this extreme, but since there was no end to his plans, he put forward the dangerous suggestion that Bavaria should take over the leadership of German commercial policy. Austrian policy, if sagaciously and boldly conducted, might readily turn this idea to account. As far as Austria was concerned, the rigid prohibitive system, infringed everywhere by an impudent smuggling traffic, was detested. Some of the malcontents demanded Austria's adhesion to the German customs union, the leader of this faction being Count Chotek, archburgrave of Bohemia,[2] but since the Bohemian manufacturers were united in their dread of German competition, the count had few supporters in his native province, the most important industrial district of the monarchy.

Even Metternich, now advanced in years, obscurely recognised that the decayed customs system of Austria must

[1] See vol. VI, p. 285.

[2] Canitz' Report, September 2, 1842.

perforce be abandoned. Years before, but too late, he had endeavoured to destroy the growing customs union. His eyes were at length opened. Visiting his Johannisberg estate in the summer of 1841, he was impressed by the developing commerce and the increasing prosperity of Germany under the ægis of commercial unity. Foreseeing that the customs union would inevitably ere long embrace the whole of Germany, he at length began to ask himself whether it would not be best for Austria to join the union in order to outsoar Prussia. Abel and the chancellor's other clericalist friends in Munich had fervently assured him that Austria's accession, which would provide a counterpoise to Prussian hegemony, was desired throughout South Germany. Fortunately for Germany, upon all economic questions Metternich remained as ignorant as he had been years before when Motz made fun of his commercio-political sagacity.

He seriously maintained that in the German empire of yore "all the members had enjoyed identical commercial privileges. His knowledge of the constitution of the customs union was as remarkable as his knowledge of German commercial history. All that was necessary, he considered, was that Austria should moderate her oppressive prohibitive tariff "as a step towards assimilation into the German customs system," failing to realise that this pitiful reform would leave Austria nearly as aloof from the customs union as were England and France. His only definite aspiration was to resist Prussia; for the rest, he could not get beyond a nebulous dilettantism. To further his ideas he wrote to Kübeck, the new leader of the Austrian financial system, whose appointment, since he was an official of bourgeois origin, had been hailed with great expectations by the public, but who soon showed himself to be devoid of creative ideas and incompetent to do away with the eternal deficit. In November, 1841, the ministers discussed the possibility of a closer understanding with Germany, but decision upon the matter was postponed, for Archduke Louis, as ever the deadly enemy of reform, presided over the deliberations; and moreover, the advisers of the throne were tacitly agreed that it would be impossible for the nongerman crown lands to adapt themselves to such designs. Two years later, when Kübeck drafted proposals for a reduction of the tariff, the plan was defeated by the opposition of the Bohemian

manufacturers. In customs affairs, as throughout the administration, the ancient "deaf-mute system" (as Canitz termed it) was immutably fixed.[1] During this period, whenever German admirers of Austria visited Vienna in the hope of securing modifications of the tariff that might facilitate German commerce, Metternich received them in a friendly spirit, but never failed to decide in the end that this was all "ideology." Canitz reported: "The use of this word has become habitual with the prince, and he frequently employs it in lieu of argument or explanation."[2]

This shapeless realm, whose population was but a confused medley of nationalities, was in a position of hopeless embarrassment as compared with the two great nations of kindred destiny, in which the self-assertiveness of youthful egoism was now manifesting itself. For a considerable period the Italians had been contemplating the German customs union with reluctant admiration, but there still remained in Italy a few good-natured patriots who did not wholy despair of Austria. In 1843 the *Annali universali di statistica* published an article by Serristori, in which the writer appealed to the Italian states to adhere by degrees to the Austrian customs system, just as the German states had accepted the Prussian customs law. So marvellously had the world been transformed, that this essay, which a quarter of a century earlier would infallibly have earned for its author a long term of imprisonment, was highly commended by the *Oesterreichische Beobachter*, which published a translation of the writing. But in this matter, as in others, Metternich showed himself to be petty, timid, and utterly uninspired. Just as twenty years earlier many of the particularist ministers of state in Germany had commended the customs union on the ground that it would build a barrier against national unity, so now did Metternich look upon the economic unification of Italy simply as a means for fighting the dreaded "sects." Moreover, the scheme to create a genuine customs association seemed to him overbold. In any case, it was impossible that the notorious customs system of Austria, with its corruptible officials and its gigantic smuggling depots in Venice, should inspire admiration in the worldly-wise Italians. The Hofburg therefore contented itself with

[1] Canitz' Report, December 13, 1843.
[2] Canitz' Report, March 20, 1843.

proposing to the Italian states, in profound secrecy, certain measures for the facilitation of trade. But even the court of Naples, which of all the governments in the peninsula was the most loyal to Austria, had absolutely no confidence in Austrian commercial policy, for there had been many acrimonious disputes upon customs matters between the Two Sicilies and Austria. The Turin government bluntly repelled the advances, for in Piedmont the idea of national unity had made extensive progress. The formation of a customs union between Sardinia, Tuscany, and the Papal States, was under consideration, Counts Petitti and Cavour had recommended the construction of an Italian railway system; and all these plans had an antiaustrian aim. The nobler and more powerful elements in Italy were joining forces to fight the court of Vienna. Beyond the Alps, as beyond the Riesengebirge, the imperial state could hinder and could mar; it could no longer create.

The German protectionist party, disillusioned, had little to expect from the immediate future. The whole trend of the time was unfavourable to protection. The leading commercial power of the world, whose proud position had been acquired beneath the shelter of tariffs and navigation laws, was at this juncture turning into the paths of free trade. As List bitterly expressed it, England's economic development had now risen to such an altitude that the country need not hesitate to kick away the ladders by which it had climbed. The doctrine of the greatest happiness of the greatest number, enunciated in earlier days by Jeremy Bentham, the father of English radicalism, was gaining ever more adherents among the British people, and was the foundation of the demand for free trade and cheapness. The middle classes, which had made their way into parliament since the passing of the reform bill, were concentrating their attacks upon the corn laws, because they felt that such power as still remained to the old nobility was based upon the tariff on corn. As far as the broad masses of the working population were concerned, these looked with suspicion upon the free trade movement, which was at once political and economic; they had even less confidence in the bourgeoisie than in the landlords; and they were afraid that the repeal of the corn laws might lead to a decline in wages—a consummation secretly desired by

many of the advocates of repeal. In 1839 the Anti-Corn Law League founded by Richard Cobden, began its propaganda among the middle classes. Amply furnished with funds by the factory owners, it held numerous public meetings, issued newspapers and pamphlets, sent its propagandists all over the country, and organised the signing of monster petitions. After six years of ceaseless agitation, the great majority of the middle classes had been won over to the cause, the strength of the movement being concentrated in Manchester and in the industrial regions of the north-west. The cry for free trade resounded throughout the country.

In the writings of the Manchester school was manifest a revival of the doctrine of natural rights, which in England had never been fully refuted from the scientific outlook. Like all dead abstractions, the principles of this doctrine could be exploited by a dull materialism no less effectively than by an overstrained idealism. It was thus possible for John Stuart Mill to be an enthusiast at one and the same time for Wilhelm Humboldt and for English radicalism. Cobden, agreeing in respect of formulas with Humboldt, though in respect of thought contrasting strongly with the German thinker, regarded the state as an assurance society founded by the arbitrary will of individuals. The sole function of this corporation was, he considered, to protect business and labour against violent disturbances, and to make its premiums to the assured as low as possible. For him, economic interest made up the entire content of human life, while quick journeys for commercial travellers and the cheap production of cotton were the supreme aims of civilisation. He was perfectly serious when he declared that Stephenson and Watt had enormously more significance in history than Cæsar or Napoleon. If trade were only allowed to take its own course in natural freedom, each nation would inevitably devote itself to those branches of industry which it could cultivate most profitably, and thus every nation would play into the hands of the others by furnishing exports which would perforce ever balance imports with perfect precision. A harmony of interests would be spontaneously established; the utterly wasteful expenditure upon standing armies would cease; the ancient prophecy would be fulfilled, swords would be beaten into ploughshares, and perpetual peace would result. Cobden honestly loved the working classes, and hoped to secure an advantage for them

by the cheapening of bread. He even defended compulsory education, because the "hands" in the factories would not be able to produce the maximum quantity of commodities unless the heads to which these hands belonged were tolerably well-informed. He was, however, strongly opposed to factory legislation, regarding it as an infringement of individual liberty.

This gospel of the service of Mammon threatened to mutilate mankind, to lop from the emotional life all heroic elements, everything that was sublime and beautiful, everything that was ideal. And yet the doctrine of voluntarism, of unrestricted competition in the total absence of coercion from the state, had a quality of bold self-confidence which could not fail to be alluring to vigorous and enterprising men. Had not the entire thought movement of the revolutionary epoch issued from the struggle of free individuality against state authority? Moreover, Cobden was inspired with an almost exaggerated enthusiasm on behalf of the sober conception of "improvement," of material progress, and he looked upon himself as the chosen apostle of universal happiness. It need hardly be said that his cosmopolitan doctrine, proceeding as as it did from this self-satisfied island people, from this race which regarded all foreigners with contempt, was to no small extent a mask for crafty mercantile designs. Cobden, indeed, had more understanding of foreign nations than had most of his fellow-countrymen; he admired Prussia; and even the unification of Germany and of Italy held no terrors for him. But at the very opening of his public career he said dryly: "Our only aim is to promote the just interests of England, regardless of the purposes of other nations." His doctrine of the universal free exchange of commodities rested upon the tacit assumption that England was to control the large-scale industry of the entire world, while other countries might have what was left in the way of production by primitive methods and by a few branches of industry which it would have been difficult to transplant to British soil. Just as Canning and Palmerston had esteemed constitutionalist phraseology, so now did Cobden esteem free trade phraseology, as a lucrative article of export which, making the round of the world, would win all nations to devote themelves to the interests of British commercial supremacy. Since the shrewd factory owners were not slow to perceive these privy implications of the free trade doctrine, the movement grew irresistibly,

so that in the end Sir Robert Peel, the prime minister, found it impossible to resist the current.

Although Peel, the son of a cotton spinner who had risen to wealth through industry and ability, was of middle-class origin, he was far from sharing Cobden's philosophy. The elder Peel's employees had been the grateful recipients of countless benefits at the hands of their philanthropic employer. Peel the statesman stood from the first high above the feelings of class interest that animated the manufacturers. He was trained in the sentiments of the tory party; in religion he was a high churchman; his education had been that of the traditional classical culture; and Pitt was his ideal as a statesman. Calm, deliberate, and cautious, he seemed a born conservative. And yet fate had cast him for the reformer's part. Again and again did the rapid movement of events compel him to scrutinise the opinions of his party, and as soon as he recognised that these views were no longer in conformity with what the welfare of the country demanded, he would immediately, with splendid moral audacity, espouse the newly recognised truth, ignoring the remonstrances of old friends and regardless of the narrow-minded traditions summed up in the phrase "ethics of party." Rarely has a statesman, without being untrue to himself, modified his opinion so often upon great political questions. In parliament, when still quite a young man, Peel had ventured to demand the resumption of cash payments by the bank of England, thus renouncing "the authority I have always followed"—the authority of his own father. Subsequently, like Wellington, he came to recognise the necessity for Catholic emancipation. Though it had hitherto been obstinately resisted by the tories, Peel now defended this reform, which led the way for all the democratic innovations of the ensuing decades. To the last he stubbornly opposed the reform bill, but directly the matter was settled and as soon as the middle classes had made their way into the lower house, he could no longer conceal from himself that the centre of gravity of the old aristocratic state structure had been shifted. Now that he was prime minister, he determined to yield to the irresistible movement for free trade, and thus to carry a stage further the policy of the reform bill.

The majority of his tory friends forsook him. In alliance with the whigs and the radicals, his sometime opponents, and amid

the jubilant acclamations of the middle classes, he moved forward on his path, not one of those statesmen whose creative intelligence enables them to dominate the era in which they live, but one of those who learn conscientiously from their surroundings. By no means a brilliant orator, he was strong in his uprightness, in his frankness, and in the courage with which he did what was needful. The proud scions of the old tory nobility looked askance at this cotton spinner, who remained ever a plebeian despite his princely wealth, the man who had shamelessly betrayed his party.[1] Benjamin Disraeli, the young tory hotspur, declared that it was mere hypocrisy to speak of Peel's government as a conservative government. The working classes, however, were already being influenced by the socialistic ideas of the Chartists, and huge petitions in favour of an increase in popular rights were pouring into parliament. The dull discontent of the masses and the poverty of the industrial regions in the north-west compelled the government to take action.

In 1842, nearly two-thirds of the duties imposed by the old tariff were removed or reduced. Further reductions followed. Then, in the year 1845, a failure of the crops resulted in unspeakable misery throughout the island realm, and above all in Ireland. It was plain to everyone that Great Britain had become a manufacturing country, that she was no longer able to feed with her own agricultural produce the enormously increased urban population. Peel now ventured upon the decisive step, and in May, 1846, the corn laws were repealed. The measure was passed by the lords, for the Iron Duke uttered a warning to the effect that if the upper house failed to comply voluntarily, it would in the end be forced to comply under pain of annihilation. So hopeless did it already seem to resist the rising power of the middle classes. A few weeks later Peel was forced to resign. His old opponents had helped him to victory, but his beaten friends now took vengeance. Had he dissolved parliament, he would undoubtedly have obtained a large majority, but, as he told Bunsen, he could have held office only with the support of the radicals, "and I won't work with the radicals."[2] He resigned, therefore, a victim to the spirit of party, and for long thereafter was extolled by the bourgeoisie as the most popular of all British

[1] Bunsen's Report, January 30, 1846.
[2] Bunsen's Report, July 10, 1846.

statesmen. He knew that, following in his father's footsteps, he had done a beneficent action for the working classes, while simultaneously consolidating the commercial power of his country—for relentless national self-assertion was no less sacred to him than to all his compatriots. To further the aims of commercial policy he did not disdain the petty arts of misrepresentation. On one occasion he said to the Prussian envoy: "You had better come to terms with us about customs matters, for otherwise a Franco-American naval alliance might readily threaten the economic and political independence of the continent." [1]

His heritage devolved upon the whigs, who had now often to cooperate with the radicals, although their own leaders, with hardly an exception, belonged to the proudest and most select families of the nobility. It was therefore possible for Lord Palmerston, who again became foreign secretary, to pursue with redoubled energy his old policy of secret incitements to breaches of the peace, and he was able to make the bears of the continent dance alternately to the piping of the liberals and to that of the free traders. The victors became affected with immeasurable self-intoxication. Cobden, drunken with delight, exclaimed: "Free trade is the Almighty's international law. Not England alone, but the entire world, has now and for ever participated in the struggle of the Anti-Corn-Law League." His adherents compared the year 1846 with the revolution of 1688. In actual fact, the repeal of the corn laws had a far-reaching influence upon social relationships, democratising society just as the reform bill had democratised the state.

Cobden, in his speeches and writings, had never ceased to assure the landowners that the reform he advocated would do them no harm, but it soon became apparent that these attempts at propitiation had either been based upon error or had been calculated deceptions. There was a notable fall in land-rents, and since the English gentry has never lacked capacity for adapting itself to circumstances, the members of this class were not slow to realise that only by adopting the instrument of power employed by the middle classes would they be able in some sort to maintain their own supremacy. Now that landed property ceased to furnish sufficient return, the landowners began to interest themselves in railways, banks,

[1] Bunsen's Report, August 26, 1844.

and industrial enterprises of all kinds. Ere long a son of the duke of Argyll could run a lucrative wine business without suffering social ostracism. While the German gentry remained poor but knightly, in England old conceptions of honour and established prejudices of caste were undermined by the potency of money. A mercantile breeze stirred the entire life of the nation. The duel, the indispensable and ultimate resource against the degradation of society, passed into disuse, and soon became altogether unknown. The horsewhip replaced sword and pistol, and this victory of barbarism was acclaimed as a triumph of enlightenment. At fashionable weddings the newspapers printed precise financial statements showing how much each wedding guest had spent upon presents or handed over in actual cash. Even the young fellows turned their sport into a business, competing for valuable prizes, what time the German students were slashing one another's faces for the sake of real or fancied honour. The breach between German and British customs continually widened. What the puritans had left of Shakespeare's merry England was now wholly subjugated by the prose of business life. Henceforward, therefore, the behaviour of the island realm in the society of nations was regulated more even than before by considerations of commercial policy.

The transformation in England inspired the free traders of all lands with victorious confidence, and during the ensuing two decades their doctrines maintained the upper hand almost universally throughout the civilised world. Every new discovery which the century could boast had contributed to bind the nations together, so that it seemed almost irrational to sever them by hostile tariffs. A long period of the mutual concession of commercial facilities began, and this favoured general well-being. But in the end the old truth was realised, that the home market is of much more importance than world trade. The peoples of the continent learned that free competition, instead of counterbalancing the power of the strong, enhances that power, and the half-forgotten ideas of List acquired renewed prestige. But before this, North America had followed England's example, and the United States' tariff had been lowered.

When German manufacturing industry was still in its infantile stage, the existence of the British corn laws had been an advantage to our country, for these laws had made

it impossible for us to enter into dangerous treaties with the unduly powerful island realm. For a long time, however, the British corn laws had been burdensome to German agriculture and to the German grain trade, and their repeal was therefore hailed with delight throughout North Germany. The financial party in Berlin learned with natural gratification that England had at length decided to imitate a step upon which Prussia had ventured twenty-eight years earlier. How congenial, too, to the Germans was Peel's honest bourgeois character; and his very independence, which had made him an object of suspicion to the tories, was pleasing to the Germans, since they were not yet entirely dominated by the spirit of faction. In Elbing, where Prince Smith had lived for so long, the mercantile community sent congratulations to the reformer. Peel's reply showed that even honest Englishmen, when they are addressing foreigners, find it difficult to abandon the "cant" of their native land. He wrote: "We thus discover in commerce the means by which we are enabled to further civilisation, to allay jealousy and national prejudices, and to establish universal peace, which is a matter of national interest no less than a matter of Christian duty." Meanwhile Cobden had dissolved his league, and had undertaken a triumphal journey through the continent, hoping to consolidate the forces of an internationalist free trade party. A simple and kindly man, he was cordially received everywhere, and was welcomed with especial warmth in Hamburg. In that city, to honour the great Briton, sanspatrie radical free trade held its saturnalia Ruperti, president of the mercantile deputation, wished long life to "commercial freedom, which is the creator of all other freedoms." Cobden sang the praises of the Hanseats' incomparable commercial policy, concluding ecstatically with the words: "Teach your neighbours to follow your example." Unquestionably England would have had cause to congratulate herself, had the customs union decided to take as guide the traditional wisdom of Hamburg.

Friedrich List was profoundly grieved by the tidings from England. Since he demanded protection for manufacturing industry alone, he had always been opposed to a duty on corn, but he was afraid (though in this he erred, as was soon to be made plain) that the free trade development of British policy might work economic injury in Germany. A large sum of money, the fruit of a national subscription, was

presented to Cobden, but the South German manufacturers bestowed a very meagre reward upon their indefatigable champion List, failing in generosity, not so much because they were avaricious, as because they were parochially minded and lacking in experience, because agitations of this character were new to Germany, where their value was hardly realised. List (a man of perfect probity, though all his opponents believed him venal) was continually in want of funds for the necessaries of life, and one of the many ironies of his stormy career was that the deadly enemy of the bureaucracy should now feel it necessary to seek an official post. But alike in his Swabian home and in Bavaria he was fobbed off with flattering words, and it was perhaps as well, for his fiery spirit would have made it difficult for him to adapt himself to the ordered activities of officialdom. He therefore led a wandering life. Visiting Austria on one occasion, he endeavoured to prove in an essay that the wealthy and thinly populated territories of the Hungarian crown constituted the natural field for German emigration. The only trouble with this alluring idea was that it was utterly devoid of historical foundation. The days of the great eastward pilgrimages had long since passed away. The urge driving modern men directed them towards the distant lands of western America.

When the decisive hour was approaching in England, List hastened to London, and easily succeeded in bewitching Bunsen, a man of sanguine temperament and ever receptive of new ideas.[1] Here List composed a lengthy essay, *The Alliance between Great Britain and Germany*, a strange memorial, whose tenour is explicable solely by List's passionately patriotic concern. Who had recognised more clearly than he the magnificent selfishness of British commercial policy? Who had better understood that the English looked upon Germany as their most dangerous rival? Yet this very man now endeavoured to win over the British by such adulations as the islanders have ever accepted phlegmatically, regarding them as well-deserved tributes paid by despised foreigners. List showed that the English could maintain their superiority vis-à-vis North America and vis-à-vis the menace of a Franco-Russian alliance only by entering into a close league with Germany. Consequently, while themselves continuing to adhere to free trade, they must agree to Germany's gradually strengthening the

[1] Bunsen's Reports, June 26 and July 31, 1846.

customs union by a high protectionist tariff. Thus at the very moment when the British government was adopting free trade, he suggested to that government that it should favour in Germany the institution of a rigid protectionist system whose shafts could only be directed against Great Britain herself. Assuredly no man with a genius for statesmanship ever erred more astoundingly.

Undismayed by the Prussian envoy's dubiety, List sent copies of this essay to Peel and to Palmerston. It need hardly be said that in each case a courteous but unfavourable answer was returned. Peel referred to the article of the free trade faith, which declares that every nation should produce those goods it can produce most cheaply. Palmerston, with a pious unction which suited the old rogue admirably, replied: "Free trade, like charity, begins at home." The memorial was also sent to Berlin, and in a covering letter to the king List ventured to offer his services, although for many years his party had been opposing Prussian policy tooth and nail. "Those err," he wrote, "who regard me as an opponent of Prussia. . . . The spirit of the illustrious ruler of Prussia is not always identical with the spirit of the Prussian bureaucracy. . . . I therefore confidently venture, in a matter which intimately concerns the advantage of the fatherland, to appeal from a prejudiced bureaucracy to your majesty's admirable freedom of mind and strength of intelligence. . . . I shall be ready to bear joyfully any burden which your majesty in your wisdom may think fit, for the good of the fatherland, to lay upon my shoulders."[1]

The letter and the memorial could not fail to please the monarch. The censorious references to the bureaucracy were agreeable to him, and in the depths of his soul he was, like the prince of Prussia, ever a protectionist. List now showed the king that the customs union would be able to remain upon the most cordial terms with England, the land which Frederick William loved so well, even if a high protective tariff were to be introduced. What could be more pleasing to the monarch? He strongly desired to find an appointment in the Prussian service for the author of the memorial, whose claims were cordially espoused by Bunsen and Rönne. List might become inspector general of railways and factories in the customs union, or else, as Bunsen suggested, might receive

[1] List to King Frederick William, July 31, 1846. See Appendix XXXVI.

the post of supervisor of German colonisation in Posen. An immediate appointment of the kind was, however, impossible, for the dissensions among the leaders of the bureaucracy still continued. When at this juncture the post of minister for finance was again vacant and Kühne was recommended for the succession, the king insisted that Kühne must first come to an understanding with List upon the principles of commercial policy, for List was about to be summoned to Berlin. But List's old opponent could not agree to the suggestion, and his refusal formed the occasion or the pretext for excluding from the ministerial council this liberal candidate, who was not in any case a persona grata to the king.[1]

List did not hear a word of these plans. For the moment he received nothing more than a formal acknowledgment of thanks, and returned home in dispirited mood. After his return he fell a prey to the terrible hypochondria by which his cheerful disposition had so often been mastered. He imagined himself to be persecuted by all the world, now that his opponents were repaying his rude onslaughts with calumny and invective. He felt quite unfit for work, and although as far as the immediate future was concerned he had no occasion for pecuniary anxiety; it seemed to him that the day was approaching when his pen would no longer enable him to support himself and his dear ones. In wretched health, and suffering from a febrile unrest, he undertook yet another aimless journey, and on November 30, 1846, he shot himself at Kufstein. This tragical close to so valuable a career was a blow to the entire nation. In Kufstein churchyard, close to the German frontier, "Germany's Friedrich List" was laid to rest. His family was provided for by a subscription raised among the protectionists, many of whom spoke of him as a victim of German ingratitude. In reality his death was no more than the consequence of a sinister illness whereby the freedom of his will was ultimately undermined. Who can say whether this man of prophetlike nature, who could only awaken, incite, inflame others, but was incompetent to lead, might not have found a more congenial field of action in a mighty parliament? This much, at least, is certain, that his whole life was embittered and saddened by the pitiful futility of German particularism, intolerable to one who contemplated wide political horizons. The full

[1] Kühne's Memoirs.

appreciation of the imperishable elements in his work remained for posterity.

In all these customs union negotiations, both the contending parties gave such fierce expression to the demand for national power that even the self-satisfied Hanseats were constrained to give some sort of expression to their patriotic sentiments. In the year 1841, Burgomaster Smidt of Bremen brought forward a plan for forming a German navigation league which was to secure a common "country" for all German and Austrian ships vis-à-vis the foreign world. Smidt personally presented his scheme to the Prussian court and to Prince Metternich. On its behalf, Carl Sieveking, the Hamburg federal envoy, then made the round of the German capitals. Sieveking was a loyal patriot, a man of high culture and earnest piety. An intimate friend of Neander and of General Gerlach, he was dear to all persons of strictly religious views because he had been cofounder of the Rauhe Haus.

Unfortunately Smidt's memorial served merely to prove that even an able statesman will have recourse to doctrinaire artifices if he is afraid to face reality. It had long been impossible to believe that the Bundestag was competent to protect the national marine. But if a navigation league were to be established side by side with the Germanic Federation and the customs union, German political life, which was already barely comprehensible to foreigners, would become complicated to an impracticable degree. Was it not, moreover, a cool demand that the customs union, whose members with the solitary exception of Prussia were inland states, should devote all its power to favouring the Hanseat mercantile marine without receiving any compensatory commercial advantages? Nay, the mere proposal that Austria should be accepted as a member of the navigation league was little short of a menace to the customs union. As Canitz pointedly remarked: "There is a simple means for founding a navigation league, and it is that the Hansa towns should join the customs union—but this does not suit their book!"[1] Moreover, the Prussian foreign office would make no concessions, for Bülow still had hopes that the North Sea coast would join the customs union. In addition, on March 28, 1843, the minister wrote to the effect that Prussia had already secured from England an arrangement

[1] Canitz' Reports, March, 1843

by which the latter power agreed to treat the outer ports essentially as customs union ports. "Thereby," declared Bülow, "we have gained a part (as much, we believe, as is now requisite) of that which the proposed German navigation league desires to secure."[1]

Two or three years later (1845), Rönne, who was ever formulating new projects, revived the plan which had broken down in the early forties, associating with it the proposal for a differential tariff system which had been recommended by Arnim in his *Testament*. A memorial issued by the Prussian ministry for commerce suggested that the German coastal states should constitute a navigation league designed to favour German navigation. By heavy retaliatory duties it was to compel foreign powers to mitigate their own navigation laws, thus preparing the way for a system of universal free trade. King Frederick William entered joyfully into the ideas of Rönne, whilst Bunsen, the fires of whose enthusiasm never needed much fanning, expressed the opinion that this navigation league would soon compel the British to repeal the navigation act.[2] In the Hansa towns, Senator Duckwitz of Bremen advocated the patriotic conception with a fine ardour, publishing a memorial in defence of Rönne's plans. Since he was a more far-sighted man than were his fellow Hanseats, he could not blind his eyes to the fact that these would not be persuaded to join the customs union. Writing appeasingly to List, he insisted that this navigation question was far more important than "pitiful disputes concerning accession to the customs union." Yet in truth this pitiful accession to the customs union was the vital matter, for the navigation league must perforce remain an airy vision as long as the North Sea coast refused to participate in the national customs community. Fully justified was the reply of Kühne, Beuth, and the other experienced men of affairs in the ministry for finance. Such a league, they said, could at most place German ships upon an equal footing; it could not equalise their freights, and this was the essential point. Moreover, the customs unions had hitherto avoided all differential tariffs. A differential tariff system necessarily involved the danger that retaliatory duties would be imposed by other powers; the union was not prepared to face this danger unless the outer ports constituted a definite part of the German customs system.

[1] Bülow, Instruction to Canitz, March 28, 1843.

[2] Bunsen's Reports, July 31, 1846, August 11, 1847, and subsequent dates.

Despite these obvious considerations, Rönne pushed forward with his designs, with the result that the dissensions among the leaders of Prussian commercial policy became glaring. In 1847, therefore, Privy Councillor von Patow visited Bremen to discuss matters with Duckwitz and with Witte, the Hanoverian, who had recently been expelled from Berlin on account of his hostile machinations. Patow gave cordial assurances of the king's desire to safeguard "the principle of German unity" by means of the navigation league. But the hard facts of business life could not be mastered by mere praiseworthy sentiments, and the plan was ultimately shipwrecked upon the decisive opposition of Hamburg. Senators Kirchenpauer and Geffcken drafted a detailed memorial, *The Differential Tariff System*, whose publication was hailed with loud acclamations by the free traders. Victorious in the critical field, the memorialists demonstrated that the transit trade of Hamburg, as it then existed, could not possibly bear differential duties. But the Hamburgers made no alternative proposals for the protection of German navigation. In their view, the scandalous anarchy of our North Sea coast was an enviable state of "free trade." Prince Smith exultingly reported to the free trade union of Berlin that the enemy had again been routed.

Meanwhile, on behalf of the customs union, the Prussian government had expressly demanded from Great Britain the same privileges that had been secured by Hanover in that country's separate treaty. The demand was to the effect that all voyages made by German ships from Baltic and North Sea ports should be treated by England as direct voyages. The British refused, for in the interim Gladstone, the sworn enemy of Germany, had entered the cabinet. In 1847, therefore, the Berlin court denounced the treaty of 1841, which had caused so much bitterness in South Germany. In this way Prussia showed once more that she had no intention to permit herself to be towed unresistingly in England's wake. The denunciation of the treaty caused much ill feeling in Downing Street, but contributed none the less to the maturing of an idea which had for some time been entertained by the new whig cabinet. The opening of the free trade policy had made the navigation act, Cromwell's work, practically untenable. Besides, the British mercantile marine was now so powerful that a measure which had rendered great services for two centuries had become superfluous. At Christmas, 1847, the

cabinet came to a decision, and in the queen's speech parliament was informed that the navigation act was about to be repealed. German navigation, therefore, could look forward to securing in the near future advantages which had long been desired.

Undismayed by the miscarriage of his navigation league, the indefatigable Duckwitz successfully inaugurated an undertaking which proved momentous for German nagivation. German export trade was now in a lamentable state. In 1837 when the enterprising Fritz Harkort actually ventured to send his steamer "The Rhine" from Cologne to London, the outward voyage was made in ballast. How ludicrous had been the campaigns which, but a few years earlier, Duckwitz had been compelled to lead against Bremen's ill-natured Guelph neighbours. At that time he had purposed to establish a steamboat service on the upper Weser as far as Hamelin, for Harkort, in a bold trial trip, had already shown that this was possible. The traditional petty objections and hindrances had at length been overcome; but at Liebenau, in Hanoverian territory, there were some rocks in mid stream, and these made regular steamship voyages on the river impracticable. In the opinion of the Hanoverian government it would be impossible to blast the Liebenau rocks. Moreover, since cartage was more lucrative to the customs treasury than fluvial navigation, the government was unwilling to hazard any money upon the engineering enterprise. But one day there called upon Duckwitz one of Harkort's travelling companions, Skipper Rolff of Prussian Minden, boldly declaring, "If you will promise me two hundred and fifty thalers I will clear the Liebenau rocks out of the way." Duckwitz agreed to the terms, and Rolff secured permission of the Hanoverian bailiff, who regarded the valiant Prussian as a lunatic. Within a few weeks Rolff returned to Bremen and reported, "The Liebenau rocks have come to port here!" Thus was the upper Weser opened for navigation, at a cost of two hundred and fifty thalers, and the steamboat service could be inaugurated. But the Guelph court was unable to stomach the audacious manner in which the calculations of its commercial policy had been upset. Criminal proceedings were taken against Rolff for exporting stone without permission, and the prosecution was not dropped for a considerable time.

These negotiations were hardly ended when Duckwitz ventured to think of a transatlantic steamship service. Heretofore there had been but one regular service of steamers plying

to North America, the Cunard Line between Liverpool and New York, which was subsidised by the British government. The marine steam engines were, however, still so weak and so uncertain that many postal administrations preferred, when winds were favourable, to send the mails by swift sailing vessels. This was the epoch of the renowned American clippers, for during the years with which we are now concerned sailing navigation attained its acme. But when the United States conceived the design of establishing a steamship line to the European continent, and of supporting the scheme by a government subsidy, Man, U.S. consul at Bremen, moved thereto by Duckwitz and other Bremen merchants, was able to secure the choice of the Weser harbour as the European port of entry. Despite the vigorous opposition of England, the American union came to terms with the German states. Two steamships, the "Washington" and the "Hermann," were fitted out for the service, America paying a subsidy of $100,000 per ship, and Germany paying a total subsidy of $286,000, of which Prussia and Bremen contributed $100,000 each. This expenditure, though stigmatised as extravagant by the radical free traders, yielded abundant return. The regular traffic spontaneously evoked new business relationships. The German postal administrations made use of the Bremen steamships, which thus constituted the nucleus of an all-German postal system. Within eight years the value of the manufactured articles exported to North America by way of Bremen rose from 3,300,000 thalers to 16,000,000 thalers. This was the modest beginning of a mighty development, the ultimate outcome of which was that Germany's transmarine commerce became greater than the country's trade with other European nations.

Many sins of omission which had almost escaped notice during the prolonged epoch of continental arrest were now felt to be a national disgrace. The Germans, communing with themselves, called to mind their ancient dominion of the seas. The publicists, led by List, impatiently demanded a German flag. The demand was justified, for foreigners hardly realised that Germany existed; and even our seamen, though they rivalled the best in the world, were in poor repute abroad, especially in view of the fact that, in accordance with the thrifty German custom, they received no more than half the wage paid to English sailors. No less vigorous was the demand for the

appointment of German consuls. It is true that Prussia already possessed two hundred and thirty such officials, but with few exceptions they were no more than merchant consuls, and they were not authorised to represent nonprussian Germans.

Loudest of all, however, was the clamour for a German navy. A generation earlier it had still seemed perfectly natural to everyone when Prussia had simply made a present to England of the French warships seized in Antwerp, since they were regarded as useless to Germany. Subsequently, on one occasion, a few casual words were uttered at the Bundestag regarding the fitting out of German warships against the Barbary corsairs.[1] But now, when the customs union had at length awakened the national self-esteem, the Germans recognised with shame that, though formidable on land, they played a ludicrous role on the seas. Yet circumstances were most unfavourable to patriotic naval plans. The Hanseats, who in their transmarine mercantile branches were on very bad terms with the firms representing the customs union, had through business acumen gained a fair position for themselves in many foreign states. Since for the most part they were still hidebound in the traditions of the old and unworthy policy of neutrality, they utterly failed to realise that they owed their existence solely to the grace of the foreigners. The commercial spirit killed national pride. On the Hamburg stock exchange it was universally considered that a German navy could do nothing but disturb the peaceful trade of the Hanseats. As far as Prussia was concerned, in this state a sense of the value of sea power had gradually been lost, owing to the fact that Prussia had been compelled for Germany's sake to devote so immoderate an amount of warlike energy to the development of her land forces.

"It is well known that water is not our element"—such were the words penned by an able officer in a *Memorial concerning the Naval Question.* Prussia, in taking over New Hither Pomerania, had secured at the same time one or two Swedish galleys in the Strela Sound (Bodden Strait). At the same time she had secured the services of two live specimens of naval officer who attracted much attention on parade in Berlin, being regarded as animal prodigies. During the reign of the late king, plans for the formation of a fleet for coastal defence had frequently been discussed, but the penuriousness

[1] See vol. II, pp. 437, 438.

of the ministry had frustrated all attempts. When crown prince, Frederick William IV had for a considerable period commanded the Pomeranian army corps, and in Stettin had frequently heard Lord Lieutenant Sack declare that Pomerania stood in need, not merely of coastal defence, but likewise of a strong Prussian fleet, one powerful enough to dominate the Baltic. The seed of Sack's teaching fell upon fruitful soil. Since the days of the Great Elector, Frederick William was the first Hohenzollern ruler to show an understanding of the importance of sea power. It is true that this understanding was merely that of the distinguished amateur.

At that time there was but one noted man in Prussia to contemplate naval questions from a comprehensive outlook and with the earnestness of the expert. This was Prince Adalbert, inspector general of artillery. As so often happens, youthful impressions influenced his whole life. He had grown to manhood near Fischbach, at the foot of Mt. Falkenstein in the Riesengebirge, where he dwelt with his parents, Prince William and the pious princess Mary Anne. One of his companions, Count von der Gröben, would frequently speak of the deeds of his ancestor, Otto Friedrich von der Gröben, the African hero from Electoral Brandenburg. Field Marshal Gneisenau, a friend and neighbour, was also fond of talking to the boy about his American travels. Ever since, the ardent and venturesome prince had dreamed of remote regions. He took long voyages as a guest on English, Russian, and Sardinian warships, making himself thoroughly at home in the sailor's life. Thus seeing the world, he realised the narrowness of the inland existence of his native country. For a growing nation, he would often say, there can be no well-being without expansion, no expansion without an overseas policy, and no overseas policy without a navy. But he would hear nothing of half-measures. Foretelling that even a small German navy would to the great naval powers seem an arrogant and irritating pretension, he insisted that if the hazard were to be made the German fleet must quickly attain a strength sufficient to enable it to hold its own in combat upon the high seas. The king lent a friendly ear to his young cousin's plans, but was unable to overrule his ministers' objections. For the nonce (1842) all that he could do was to order the building of the first royal Prussian warship, the corvette "Amazon." Under the command of the Danish captain

Dirckinck-Holmfeld this vessel, used as a training ship, made frequent voyages in the Baltic, and occasionally ventured on the high seas. Apart from a few royal steam packets in the Baltic, the corvette was all that could bear the name of a German navy, for everyone knew that the Austrian fleet, the heritrix of the Venetian navy, would never subserve the aims of German policy. Yearningly did the patriots reiterate the plaint from Freiligrath's *Naval Dreams*:

> Give speech to any German pine, 'twould say:
> "As warship's mast upthrust into the air,
> Proud should I be the youthful flag to bear,
> The union flag, when dawns Germania's day!"

Germany's urgent need of a naval force was painfully apparent at this precise juncture, when the persistent emigration of those who were lost to the fatherland for ever was arousing in wide circles a demand for German colonies. Bunsen often discussed the matter with his English friends. Indefatigably did he puff forth his political soap-bubbles into the patient atmosphere, whilst Peel and Aberdeen, looking on with a friendly smile, held the basin and mixed the suds. As soon as it was noised abroad that there had been talk of a national German flag, Aberdeen remarked with much delicacy: "This is a splendid idea. It is altogether to England's interest that certain intermediate navies (des marines intermédiaires) should come into existence between the British navy and the French."[1] But when Bunsen innocently asked the prime minister whether England could not cede one of her colonies to Germany in order to save the latter power from the risks of over-population, Peel rejoined that this would be a very difficult matter, and added "Would it not be better for Germany to acquire Porto Rico?" Indubitably the island was far too small. Moreover, having a tropical climate, it was unsuitable for regular colonisation by Europeans. But it possessed one great advantage: it belonged to the crown of Spain, and the generous English could therefore without undue sacrifice offer it to the Germans.

Out of this flux of nebulous proposals there emerged one suggestion which seemed to promise fruit. California, the almost uninhabited land on the Pacific coast of North America, whose golden treasures were still quite unsuspected, was at this epoch almost masterless, and the bankrupt republic of Mexico

[1] Bunsen's Report, June 20, 1843.

seemed by no means loath to dispose of the worthless possession at a moderate figure. What idea could be more agreeable to the imaginative minds of Rönne and Bunsen? Both hoped to secure California for Prussia and to found a great free city in San Francisco Bay. Aberdeen once more showed himself to be a generous giver. He cheerfully approved the suggestion, and enquired whether Prussia would not do well in addition to reach out further northward, and to acquire the Oregon region. Yet Bunsen could not fail to be aware that the United States, guided by the Monroe doctrine, would never tolerate the formation of a new European colony upon the American continent. He was actually informed by McLane, U.S. ambassador in London, that the government of the union definitely purposed to take advantage of the confusions in Central America in order to extend its own dominion as far as the isthmus of Panama. Nevertheless the acquisition of California was not altogether unthinkable, if Prussia could come to a secret understanding with Mexico—and if, having gained her colony, she could protect it by sea power! Bunsen was ready for the emergency, for when was he not? Denmark, deadly enemy of the old Hanseatic League, oppressor of the German nationality in Schleswig, was none the less a member of the Germanic Federation, and she found it difficult to meet the cost of her navy. Why should not the Danish king become high admiral of the new Hanseatic League, sea lord of the customs union, and, invested with this dignity, defend the Prussian colony of California? Were this done, one or two Prussian battalions would suffice to guard the country from within. The Prussian envoy unfolded these proposals to his colleague Count Reventlow, a true Dane, who was secretly endeavouring to win over the British court to agree to the destruction of the independence of Schleswig-Holstein. None the less, Reventlow was on friendly terms with Bunsen, and was by no means sparing in commendation of the latter's plans. Still, the Berlin foreign office felt it necessary to ornament Bunsen's ingenious reports with large interrogation marks in the margin, and Bunsen was not spared the distress of seeing his ideas succumb to the fate which commonly awaits soap-bubbles.[1]

It was inevitable that German diplomatists should spin

[1] Bunsen's Reports: August 25, 1842; July 30, 1844; March 5, 1845; August 18, 1846.

these cobwebs when they endeavoured to pursue transoceanic policies without the support of a German fleet. Prince Adalbert's warnings were abundantly justified. Sieveking of Hamburg could do nothing in face of England's opposition when he endeavoured to acquire for Germany the Chatham islands in the southern Pacific. Moreover, public opinion was as yet by no means clear as to the importance of colonial possessions. Many able Germans considered that the era of colonial policy had been outgrown, although England was continuing year by year to win for herself in all quarters of the world lands destined to play a great part in the future. Making a virtue of necessity, the Germans who held these views regarded their country as exceptionally fortunate precisely because of the inland restrictions imposed upon her political life. Even Heinrich von Arnim, the eloquent advocate of a national commercial policy, went so far as to maintain that the customs union was enabled to conclude favourable commercial treaties precisely because it was lucky enough to have no colonies. Since the American war of independence had terminated in the loss of the British colonies in North America, since Spanish America had thrown off the yoke of the mother country, the radical free traders considered it axiomatic that every colony, as soon as it gained maturity, would infallibly break away from the parent stem. They failed to recognise that the two great revolutions just mentioned were the outcome of peculiar historic conditions, conditions which would not necessarily or universally recur. Still less did they realise how Greater England and Greater Spain had gained a firmer standing in the world through the increasing diffusion of their respective nationalities, languages, and civilisations—had gained this despite the political secession of the colonies. The entire world was now known to geographers, and there was no longer any occasion to fear another barbarian migration. The massed aristocracy of the European peoples was beginning to partition the dominion of the transoceanic world, and in this titanic struggle, which occupied the second half of the nineteenth century, the Germans played but a modest part.

Emigration from Germany still took place almost exclusively to North America. The number of emigrants increased threefold within a brief period, expanding during the years 1840 to 1847 from 34,000 to 110,000. Prussia, although her liberal social legislation had hitherto rendered her comparatively

immune, was now affected by the movement. During the year 1846 more than 16,000 emigrants left Prussian territory, most of them departing from the small landed estates of the densely populated district of Treves. Since the persecution of the demagogues had been temporarily suspended, there were now few men of culture among the exiles. By far the most notable was J. A. Röbling from Thuringia, an engineer of genius, already famous for his funicular railways and suspension bridges, and subsequently to acquire a world-wide reputation by bridging Niagara Falls and East River. Most of the emigrants were South German villagers. Already on the voyage they had much to suffer, for the wretched sailing ships of the Hansa towns were not as yet subjected to any proper inspection. Once across the Atlantic they were as a rule speedily swallowed up by the great foreign nationality, for the gymnastic clubs and choral societies with which they endeavoured to keep alive their memories of the fatherland had absolutely no political significance. At this epoch the Yankee attitude towards German immigrants was essentially one of contempt.

Germany seemed almost without resource in face of this movement. Indeed, there were parliamentarians in the South German chambers who positively recommended emigration to avert the reputed danger of over-population. Many anxious communes in Saxony, Hesse, and Baden were even willing to pay the travelling expenses of those among the poor who desired to leave for the promised land in the west. The governments, however, recognised that the losses inflicted upon the country by emigration were irremediable, and Bodelschwingh declared that we must at least avoid doing anything to promote this national disaster. On the other hand, there was a general feeling that nothing could be done to counteract the irresistible migratory impulse, though it might be possible to impose sharper supervision upon the emigration agents, whose alluring advertisements were now displayed on the walls of every village inn throughout South and Central Germany. The practical question was what could be done to protect the immigrants and to retain them for the old national stock. In February, 1845, Eichhorn discussed the problem in an able memorial. The statesman who had so successfully guided the customs union perceived very clearly that without naval forces of her own Germany could not acquire transoceanic

colonies. He hoped, however, that emigration might be made advantageous to the fatherland if the emigrants, with the aid of Prussian consuls, were to form massed settlements in their new homeland, and were, with the assistance of Germany, to make the best possible use of the forces of church and school for the preservation of the German language and civilisation. The foreign office scented danger even in these unpretentious suggestions, which were in truth by no means above criticism. No one can have two fatherlands; and since the Germans in their own land were still devoid of clear political insight, it would hardly improve matters to obscure yet further their consciousness of state relationships. Every nationality becomes mongrelised when it cuts loose from the parent state, but as far as these renegade sons of the fatherland who deliberately became American citizens were concerned, Prussia could exercise no protectorate over them should the United States government, as was to be anticipated, object to such a course.

Some of the emigrants cherished similar ideas. In Texas a masonic order was founded under the name of Teutonia, its members being pledged to maintain their national peculiarities. A loftier aim was that of the "Society for the Protection of German Immigration in Texas," which hoped to found an independent colony, or perhaps even a German state—for Texas, detached from Mexico, had not yet attained a definite political organisation. The dukes of Nassau, Coburg, and Meiningen, the prince of Rudolstadt, the landgrave of Homburg, and nineteen princes and counts belonging to the mediatised nobility, were members of the society. Prince Leiningen, stepbrother of Queen Victoria, a man of multifarious activities, was president. The example of the benevolent Frederick William had aroused philanthropic zeal in all circles of the high nobility. People were enthusiasts on behalf of the assistance of the poverty-stricken emigrants, and endeavoured, though at first without success, to gain the assistance of the pious king.[1] Unfortunately the well-meant undertaking was inaugurated with a superficiality characteristic of distinguished persons knowing nothing of business. The capital of $80,000 was quite inadequate. The political calculations upon which the scheme was based proved illusory, for Texas joined the American union in the year 1845. Prince Charles of Solms-

[1] King Frederick William to Thile, December 5, 1843.

Braunfels, a fanciful, good-humoured, and boastful youth, paid a visit to Texas, where he founded the town of Neu-Braunfels and organised the district of Sophienburg, named after a German princess whom he delighted to honour. But he soon tired of the affair. Of the five thousand emigrants sent by the princely society to Texas during the years 1845 and 1846, more than two-thirds perished miserably. The fifteen hundred survivors, vigorously led by Commissary General von Meusebach, learned to fend for themselves; but in the end, like all the other German immigrants into the American union they became German-English Americans. The lamentable failure of this society, which was dissolved in the year 1847, had an unfortunate reaction upon home politics, for the radicals, who beneath the surface were at work with growing success, were not slow to turn the unfortunate affair to account. At the public meetings held in the year of revolution the demagogues were fond of alluding to the thousands of sturdy plebeians who upon the fever-stricken shores of Texas had fallen victim to princely stupidity. There was indeed no remedy. So long as Germany had no imperial authority, emigrants from the country would necessarily become severed from the parent state, and would most of them lose even the nationality of their homeland.

§ 3 RAILWAYS AND THE MONEY POWER. SOCIAL UNREST.

Meanwhile railway development was effecting a mighty transformation in economic life. The need for utilising the new discovery was now becoming so obvious that opposition was practically silenced. Among notable politicians in Europe there were but two men who remained irreconcilable adversaries of the railways, one of these being C. L. von Haller, the restorer of political science, and the other Cancrin, the russified German, who was, however, unable to prevent the beginnings of railway construction in the empire of the czars. General Aster's attitude was sceptical, but he had few supporters in the Prussian army. H. von Moltke, who had now returned home as a major upon the general staff, actually became one of the directors of the Berlin and Hamburg railway, and wrote a luminous article for the *Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift*, entitled "What considerations should guide us in planning the course of railway lines?" There were not

wanting other efficient officers to insist that the government must promote railway development in accordance with a carefully considered plan.[1] Since the king had held similar opinions while still crown prince, the ministry of state proceeded in 1842 to plan a railway network covering the entire monarchy, and again and again the question was debated whether it would not be best for the lines to be constructed by the state.

The national finances were flourishing to an enviable degree, success in this field being the strong point of Frederick William's reign. By 1847 the national debt had been reduced to 137,000,000 thalers, and governmental securities were quoted at high figures. When the five per cent. loan had been successfully called in, the government ventured to reduce the interest on the national debt from four per cent. to three and a half per cent., the latter figure being well below the current rate, although Count Alvensleben, in justified alarm, declared that this penuriousness in the payment of interest would hit the creditors of the state very hard and would perhaps tend to divert private capital into bubble companies.[2] During the years 1833 to 1848 the yield of the domains increased from 4,200,000 thalers to 5,250,000 thalers. At the most modest calculation the state received from its entire landed property an annual rent of 6,250,000 thalers, whilst the disbursements for interest were only 5,000,000 thalers. Despite the remission of taxation, the revenue from the taxes continued to increase, so that in the year 1847 the total income of the monarchy already exceeded 67,000,000 thalers. For these reasons the construction of state railways was widely considered unobjectionable and even indispensable. This was plainly manifest in the deliberations of the united committees.[3] It was impossible to maintain that private employees would provide a better railway service than well-tried state officials. The management of railway enterprise needs nothing more than strict order and probity. Since railways are monopolies from the very nature of the case, the stimulus of free competition, whereby private enterprises in general are spurred on to great things, does not enter into the question.

In view of all these considerations, even Rother, the

[1] Major-General von Röder to Thile, May 12, 1841, accompanying a memorial by Major Fischer, concerning Railways.

[2] Alvensleben to Thile, March 12; Voss to Thile, March 13, 1842.

[3] See vol. VI, pp. 518 et seq.

veteran minister, began to be friendly to the idea of state construction. A few months after the prorogation of the united committees, he presented to the ministry (February 21, 1843) a long memorial entitled *The Furtherance of Railway Construction.* He expressed it as his definite opinion that state construction would be preferable. The state, he said, was in any case master of the high roads; the state would manage the railways better than any joint stock company; in view of the favourable position of the national finances the venture might well be undertaken. On the other side of the count, however, came the old and insuperable legal difficulty that in the absence of a national assembly the crown could not issue loans. Besides, the government had already informed the provincial diets that for the present there was no idea of constructing state railways. It was for these reasons alone that Rother recommended a half-measure, which was obviously intended to be transitional, to be a step on the way to the state railway system of the future. He proposed that the state should have the main lines constructed by joint stock companies under state guidance and supervision. From its regular revenues the state was to provide 2,000,000 thalers yearly for the railways; in case of need it was to guarantee the shareholders interest at the rate of three and a half per cent.; the interest upon its own shares was to be accumulated in a special railway reserve fund intended for the purchase of the railways at a later date, perhaps in twenty years. Thus the state would always be in the position of creditor, never in that of debtor, and there would be no infringement of the national debt law of 1820.[1] Valid legal objections could be raised to these concluding propositions. Many of the other ministers, and above all the thrifty Thile, regarded Rother's plans as unduly venturesome. But Frederick William approved them, and railway policy during the next few years was substantially guided by the suggestions of the memorial.

In the central and western provinces, private capital showed itself far too ready to engage in hazardous enterprises. For the first time Berlin fell a prey to the fever of stock exchange speculation from which since then the capital has so often suffered. England set the bad example. Since the business world had not yet realised the superior advantages

[1] Rother, Memorial, The Furtherance of Railway Construction, handed to Thile on February 21, 1843.

attaching to great railway concerns, bubble companies abounded in Great Britain. During the twelve years down to 1844, forty-four railway companies had come into existence; in 1845 one hundred and eighteen new companies were formed; plans were afoot for no less than twelve hundred and sixty-three additional concerns, with a nominal capital of £562,000,000.[1] Not until many years of painful experience had elapsed was the great North-Eastern railway company formed out of the fusion of thirty-seven petty lines. By her comparative poverty, and by more stringent state supervision, Prussia was preserved from so disastrous a speculative fever, but nevertheless even here the dance around the altar of the golden calf was utterly shameless. Men of all classes, among whom were even to be found officers in uniform, distinguished artists, and professors, thronged the stock exchange to chaffer for the shares of all countries. Of a sudden was promulgated the law of March 24, 1844, prohibiting all time bargains in Prussian scrip and all business of whatever kind in the share certificates of other lands. The law had been drafted by Bodelschwingh. Severe but indispensable, its effect was drastic, for it had been issued by the absolute crown without warning, and the business world had not been prepared for it in any way by the proceedings of a deliberative assembly. The upshot of the measure was that, after heavy losses, private capital took alarm, investors were shy, and all the stock exchanges complained that money was scarce.

Despite these difficulties, railway construction steadily advanced. By the year 1847 two hundred and eighty miles [German] of lines had been opened in Prussia, and the state had guaranteed interest amounting to 29,000,000 thalers. Completed, or nearly so, were the great lines to Stettin, to the Austrian frontier of Silesia, to Saxony, and westward through Thuringia. The Berlin-Hamburg railway was built after Mecklenburg and Hamburg had contributed a considerably larger portion of the capital than was furnished by Prussia, and when the petty spirited opposition of the crown of Denmark had at length been overcome. The important connection between Berlin and the western provinces offered peculiar difficulties. Fortunately, however, the Brunswick finances were almost entirely controlled by Amsberg, an exceedingly energetic man. As far back as the twenties, with remarkable foresight,

[1] Bunsen's Report, November 18, 1845.

he had formed comprehensive plans for a railway system in north-western Germany. In 1838, finding it impossible to get anything done by the Guelph royal court, he had founded the first state railway in Germany, the Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel-Harzburg line. Passing through a region where trade was brisk, this flourishing railway was the foundation of the great line between the Spree and the Rhine. In the east, junctions were formed with the Prussian lines. In accordance with the custom of the day these latter were constructed by various small companies, which had laboriously to effect working agreements. Among these eastward ramifications were the Magdeburg-Halberstädt line and the Magdeburg extension of the Berlin-Potsdam railway. In the west, Hanover had to follow this lead. King Ernest Augustus was long recalcitrant, but as soon as he had recognised the necessity for railway development he pushed the matter with his wonted energy, insisting only that the line must traverse as much Hanoverian territory as possible. Prussia demanded a railway running from the town of Hanover north-westward by way of Neustadt. From Nienburg there was to be a branch to Bremen, so that Westphalia could be connected with the city on the Weser by the shortest possible route. The Guelph ruler objected. He preferred the southern route from Hanover to Minden, proposing to build an extremely inconvenient but very long and exclusively Guelph line from some railway station in Hanover to Bremen. Since it proved impossible either to coerce or to persuade the stubborn old man, Prussia had in the end to agree to the building of the Brunswick-Hanover-Minden line.[1] To this there finally became connected the trunk line from Minden to Cologne. The upshot was that the wealthy and industrial province of Westphalia, on whose behalf Harkort the Westphalian had campaigned many years before in this matter of railway development, did not secure railway connection with the trunk lines until the late date of 1847. The factories and mines of the province had suffered grievously during the long delay.

Meanwhile the Prussian government had been forced to realise that the cautious policy of furnishing support and guaranteeing interest would not enable it to attain the desired goal. In the new French Eastern railway a trunk line was

[1] Reports to the king: from Thile, March 3, 1842; from Bodelschwingh, March 29, 1843; from Flottwell and Canitz, October 30, 1845.

being constructed extending to the Prussian frontier near Forbach, whilst on the German side a Palatine railway company was constructing a line through the hills of Westrich to Neunkirchen. Should these lines be completed, railway communication between France and Germany on the only direct route which then seemed possible would be almost completed. The respective terminuses of the two lines named would be separated merely by a narrow strip of Prussian territory, and here were situated the great coal mines of the Saarbrück basin, most of which were the property of the state. Further hesitation was impossible. In 1847 the crown decided upon the construction of the first Prussian state railway, the Saarbrück line—short, but of enormous economic importance.

In case of need this line could have been built without issuing a loan, the funds being provided from the abundant surpluses, but a new and far more difficult task had now been imposed upon the state. To the proposed railway network there was still lacking an important link, the trunk line eastward to Königsberg. Old Prussia, the king's favourite region, was in an unfavourable geographical situation, and Frederick William rightly conceived it to be his duty to connect it as soon as possible with the capital, thus giving it access to Central European commerce. The course of the railway was debated for a considerable time. Rönne, who continued to cling to his peculiar notions, recommended "for the sake of sea communications" that the line should run from Stettin through Further Pomerania. Having little knowledge of eastern Prussia, he was not aware that Further Pomerania might be regarded to all intents and purposes as an inland region, seeing that less than any other sea does the Baltic influence the life of those who dwell upon its shores. At the outset the king seemed inclined to approve the proposals of this trusted adviser. His ministers, however, taught by the experiences of recent years, recognised that wherever possible railways should follow the old trade routes, and they therefore recommended that the Eastern railway should run up the Warthe and the Netze through Landsberg to Bromberg, and thence down the Vistula valley. This suggestion gained the day, for the East Prussian estates implored the king not to forget his old and proud cities on the Vistula.[1] It now appeared that there was a

[1] Rönne's Memorial Concerning the Eastern Railway, January 14, 1845. Reports to the king: from Rother, December 9, 1844; from Flottwell, January

lack of private capital for this enterprise. The railway company, among whose principal supporters were the great banking firm of Mendelssohn & Co., and a number of the most distinguished men in East Prussia, suddenly declared that in view of the shortage of money which had prevailed on the stock exchanges since the passing of the new share law, it would be quite impossible to find the thirty to forty million thalers requisite for the great undertaking. A desperate resolution had therefore to be taken, for the crown could not possibly draw back after so many pledges had been given and so much preliminary work had been done. On March 16, 1847, the ministry of state decided that the state would build the Eastern railway, and would at once demand from the united diets, which were about to assemble, the approval of an extensive loan. The king agreed to the proposal. He had no inkling how strangely the fate of his Eastern railway was to become involved with that of the struggle for a constitution.[1]

Whilst Prussia's commercial policy was thus continually hindered by legalist considerations, the minor states of the Federation, thanks to their constitutions, were free from such difficulties. Moreover, their finances were flourishing, seeing that they had all left to Prussia provision for the defence of the fatherland, Baden devoting to the army no more than one-fifth of her total expenditure. These governments were therefore able earlier than Prussia to venture upon the construction of state railways. Such a course, was, indeed, forced upon most of them, for in South Germany and in Hanover private capital showed itself less enterprising than in Prussia and Saxony. But the only governments which from the very first, and on principle, recognised the preponderant advantages of state railways, were those of Brunswick and Baden.

In Brunswick there could everywhere be traced the strong hand of Amsberg, who in these matters excelled all other German statements. In Baden, Nebenius had secured the acceptance of state railways. The plans were broadly conceived, but were not well carried out. Although Baden owed its commercio-political importance mainly to transit trade, petty local interests pressed their claims, and a local gauge was

16, 1845. King Frederick William to Flottwell, March 18 and October 17, 1845. Petition from the Prussian provincial diet to the king, February 1, 1845. Protocol of the ministry of state, November 13, 1845.

[1] Reports to the king: from Rother, January 3, 1845; from the ministry of state, March 16, 1847.

adopted, differing from that of other German railways, lest foreign railway carriages or trucks should cross the sacred frontier. The chief weakness of a state railway system is the possibility that partisan considerations may determine construction and management, and this weakness was painfully displayed in the exemplary constitutionalist state, which had so long been devastated by the spirit of faction. The busy manufacturing town of Lahr lay off the track of the state railway, and when the municipal councillors complained to Blittersdorff, the minister's reply was: "Get your railway built by your liberal deputies!" The Main-Neckar railway, whose construction had been agreed upon with the grand duchy of Hesse, did not run directly through the thickly populated districts of the upper Bergstrasse to reach Heidelberg, nor did it take the westward route to Mannheim, for these cities were in disfavour owing to their liberal sentiments. Instead, midway between Heidelberg and Mannheim, in the sandy Rhenish plain, a ridiculously chosen junction was effected at Friedrichsfeld. In Würtemberg the government began state railway construction as early as 1841, for the country was afraid it might be ignored in the plans for railway development, and private capital lacked enterprise. The matter was then pushed with great zeal, Würtemberg declaring herself definitely opposed to "the corruption, the new feudalism" of private railway construction, and actually venturing to construct, within a few miles of the Augsburg-Lindau line, a parallel railway from Ulm to Friedrichshafen, to prevent Bavaria from monopolising the trade of Lake Constance. In Bavaria, again, the petty companies responsible for sections of the line between Augsburg and Hof were incompetent to carry on their undertakings, so that the state was compelled to take action. But the Palatiners, wealthier and more enterprising, were successful in the work of private railway construction.

The Saxon government, the most experienced of all in this new domain, desired in the first instance to secure the advantages derivable from transit trade, and brought forward a well-considered plan for railway communications with Silesia, Bohemia, and Bavaria. But even in this country, where industry was so flourishing, private capital was not able to make a success of any other line than the Leipzig-Dresden, which naturally reaped a golden harvest. In the case of other and less lucrative railways, the state was forced within

a few years to take over the work. In Hanover, thanks to that country's sapient commercial policy, industrial capital was as yet almost unknown, the result being that from the first the state was constrained to undertake the task of railway development. This was pushed forward vigorously enough, but without forethought. The two main lines from Hamburg and Bremen did not run to the capital, but had their respective terminuses a good many miles away, at Lehrte and Wunstorf. No one as yet realised what could be learned only from experience, the supreme importance of junctions to railway traffic. For some years now the Electoral Hessians had entertained grandiose designs of railway construction, for they hoped that Cassel would be the centre of the German railway network. But by his sloth and malevolence, the prince regent marred everything. At length a joint stock company was permitted to undertake the construction of a railway to link up Thuringia with Westphalia, the favour of the ruler being secured by the adoption of the pretentious name of "Frederick William Northern Railway." The Main-Weser line from Cassel to Frankfort was to be built at the cost of the state in conjunction with Hesse-Darmstadt, the diet voting for the purpose a loan of six million thalers. The house of Rothschild, commissioned to negotiate the loan, exceeded the specified sum by 750,000 thalers, and claimed this surplus of twelve and a half per cent. as a hard-earned fee. The Prussian envoy, Count Galen, merely related an open secret when he reported that the trusty court banker went halves with the electoral prince. Galen's actual words were: "At the expense of the country, the regent and his Jewish partner have pocketed a tidy sum." [1] This being the case, honest Wippermann, the deputy, effected nothing when in the chamber he raised the question of Rothschild's knavery.

Upon the recently completed high road from Kiel to Altona the coaches of the royal Danish diligence service plied daily, conveying from four to six persons over this stretch in thirteen hours. "What more can anyone want?" asked simple folk in amazement, when in the two cities companies were founded for the construction of a railway. At first the plan seemed hopeless. When Czar Nicholas was passing through Holstein, the promoters begged him to take a few shares so that the charm of his great name might attract

[1] Galen's Report, July 4, 1846.

other purchasers. But in 1842, Franz Hegewisch was commissioned by the town of Kiel to visit Copenhagen. Handling his patron, the astute and vain King Christian VIII, with professional dexterity, Hegewisch furnished the monarch with precise calculations, and proposed that the railway should bear the name of the "King Christian VIII Baltic Railway."[1] Such a bait was no less irresistible in Copenhagen than it had been in Cassel. The railway was approved, and was opened for traffic within two years. It is true that the king did not realise what was in the mind of his loyal Holsteiners when they planned the line, and he was greatly incensed when, shortly afterwards, at the Kiel medical congress, Hegewisch fearlessly declared that the new railway was destined to bind the undivided Schleswig-Holstein with the German fatherland. All the more determined, therefore, was the king to repress the aspirations of Lübeck, Denmark's ancient enemy, when this city now desired to enter into vigorous competition with the aspiring town of Kiel. The king refused the detested Lübeck permission to build a Hamburg-Lübeck railway or even a branch to connect with the Berlin-Hamburg line. Since Mecklenburg, too, anxious concerning the future of the ports of Wismar and Rostock, would not allow the construction of a track to Schwerin, Lübeck, alone among the Hansa towns, remained for many years destitute of railway communications.

Before long the various railway administrations came to realise that some order must be imposed upon the spontaneous anarchy of these petty lines. Four great railway amalgamations came into being: a North German group, centring in Berlin; a lower Rhenish group, centring in Cologne; a South-Western group, centring in Frankfort; and a Bavarian group, centring in Augsburg. The companies in these various unions came to terms upon common working principles, especially as regards freight, for it was already becoming apparent that goods traffic was more remunerative than passenger traffic, and that to many branches of industry the question of railway rates was a more vital matter than that of protection by tariffs. Despite many mistakes and numerous follies, the splendid way in which this land without a metropolis forged ahead of the more centralised and wealthier France, was a most invigorating spectacle. The French might boast as much as they pleased,

[1] Hegewisch, Draft for a royal Patent concerning the King Christian VIII. Baltic Railway, March, 1842.

but the sun did not always rise over Europe in the west. Among the populace, indeed, there was still manifest here and there some opposition to the new development. Many little towns in Bavaria petitioned the king to spare them the affliction of railways, for they obscurely realised that the new discovery would bring more harm than good to small settlements unsuited for manufacturing industry. These isolated opponents were derided in the press as wise men of Gotham, for almost universally people were contemplating the new age with extravagant hopes. It seemed as if Aladdin's lamp had been discovered. At Peina, the nucleus of the Hanoverian horse trade, when the railway was opened, the citizens sang, "For Peina dawns new life to-day!"

Meanwhile Morse, the American, and Wheatstone, the Englishman, had elaborated the German discovery of the electric telegraph and had adapted it for daily use. It was time. The semaphores were too uncertain, and in the foggy days of winter a message might take five days in transit from London to Berlin. At this juncture a German technical expert was once again able to turn to fuller account the work of foreigners. Werner Siemens, a Prussian lieutenant of artillery, made use of guttapercha, an elastic material of vegetable origin which had just found its way into the European markets, to insulate telegraph wires. In 1847 he made his first experiment, over a wire connecting Berlin with Grossbeeren, thus laying the foundation for the German system of telegraphy. Before long the firm of Siemens and Halske was working for the world market.

It was impossible that the Bank of Prussia should remain unaffected by this extensive transformation in commercial life. In the last decade, since 1837, the bank had developed vigorously under the sagacious guidance of Rother. Risky dealings on the stock exchange had been restricted; the handling of bills of exchange had been subjected to stricter supervision; and the harassing deficit, a relic of Napoleonic days, had been reduced to 3,400,000 thalers.[1] The annual turnover had increased from 264,700,000 thalers to 373,600,000 thalers. Berlin with its 408,000 inhabitants and 712 merchants in a large way of business, had now really become a considerable town. As radiating point for the new railways and as

[1] See vol. III, pp. 395 et seq.

a seat of commerce and industry, it was a place of power. Even as a money market it was scarcely inferior in importance to Frankfort. Stock exchange speculation, which the state had unfortunately contributed to promote by the premature reduction of interest on national securities, had been a part cause of the growth of the bank's business, but on the whole the increasing demands made upon the institution were no more than the natural consequences of the awakening spirit of enterprise. Since 1838, private capitalists had furnished more than one hundred million thalers for the Prussian railways, beyond question a larger sum than the state had devoted to this purpose within so brief a period.

How was the bank to meet the demands of its deposit business and its bill of exchange business, which had now increased almost fourfold, with its note issues of six million thalers, and the two millions in cash assigned to it by the state? Rother demanded that the bank's working capital should be increased by ten million thalers, and that notes to this amount should be issued. A man of thoroughly practical mind, he had risen from the position of regimental clerk to that of minister of state, remaining always in touch with the business world. Just as formerly, to the horror of the official class, he had summoned Schickler the banker to assist in the national debt administration, so now did he declare that the management of the Bank of Prussia must inspire general confidence in the note issues, and that on behalf of its expanding business activities the bank must acquire precise knowledge of the conditions prevailing in the contemporary market. For these reasons the ten millions of new capital must be furnished by private capitalists, and the owners of the new banking shares must be given a representative voice in the management. Thus the bank, whilst remaining a state institution under the guidance of a royal president (for Rother would never have consented to entrust the national deposits to a private bank), was nevertheless to maintain a position so independent that its committee of private shareholders would at any time be able to overrule the dangerous suggestions of a thoughtless minister for finance.

In view of the needs of a greatly expanded commerce, Rother's proposals seemed cautious, if not positively timid. Yet their underlying idea was sound, for it was in conformity with the popular spirit of this monarchy, which has ever done its best work when its powerful state authority has

cooperated with the free energies of the nation. Yet on all sides passionate opposition to the bank president's plans was manifested. In letters consisting almost entirely of abuse, Schön railed against the ignorance, the presumption, the megalomania, of Rother the clerk and his Jewish cohort. The angry man's mind was still full of the tragical memories of the year 1806, and he was afraid lest the appearance of a French battalion in Treves would suffice without ado to render the ten million thalers' worth of bank notes worthless. On the other hand, the resourceful Bülow-Cummerow had conceived the idea of a great national bank, independent of the state but receiving special privileges. With a capital of twenty-five million thalers, it was to be at one and the same time a mortgage bank, a deposit bank, and a bank of issue. He advocated this plan in numerous writings, which had all been elaborated by the skilled pen of his nephew Killisch von Horn; and he secured the full approval of Rönne, for whom a scheme could never be too hazy. Flottwell, the minister for finance, was likewise talked into supporting the idea. A novice in banking matters, he was unwilling that the state should undertake any risky economic responsibilities, and he turned a credulous ear when some of the speculators on the Berlin stock exchange expounded the wonderful possibilities of the proposed national bank. At first, as so often before, the king seemed to have been won over by Rönne's fiery eloquence.

Rother, now well on in years, was ill at ease. He had long realised that his dry business outlook seemed tedious to the talented monarch, and had gone so far on one occasion as to ask frankly whether the king still trusted him. Frederick William, who knew that he had no more loyal servant than Rother, answered graciously: "Clear these fancies out of your head, and rejoice that you possess the full confidence of your affectionate F. W." Simultaneously, one evening when he had just returned from the theatre he wrote to Thile: "I have, my dearest Thile, just received a note from old Rother, who is in a tantrum. Calm him down if you can, and convince him that, CHOSE INCROYABLE, *his imagination has actually run away with him.* At the moment I am absolutely permeated with classic-hellenic woe having witnessed the sinister end of that innocent criminal old Œdipus, son of Laios." [1] None the

[1] Rother to the king, October 31; King Frederick William to Rother, November 1, to Thile, November 1, 1845.

less, the minister felt that his position was endangered. When the commercial council met in December, 1845, under the presidency of the monarch, to hear Bülow-Cummerow's proposals, and then to decide whether there was to be a state bank or a national bank, Rother said bitterly to his friends, "I am only summoned in council because I am an old jackass." [1] He was destined to be very agreeably disillusioned. It was, after all, an utterly preposterous idea that the Bank of Prussia, which to the glory of the monarchy had so honourably extricated itself from a position of almost hopeless embarrassment, should with its well-tried officials and its longstanding business relationships now be suddenly swept away in favour of a new and hazardous creation. What security did the new undertaking offer? Even Bülow, a wealthy and independent landowner, was doubtless animated by the best intentions in the world, although the Berlinese privy councillors maligned him as a dangerous place-hunter. His life was guided by the excellent motto of the most prolific of the noble stocks of Germany, "All Bülows are trusty." But the bank he had founded in Stettin, which had made itself responsible for the early stages of high road construction in Pomerania, had never been on a perfectly sound footing, and its management was not conspicuous for prudence or orderliness.

These considerations made a profound impression on Frederick William. Often enough, now, he was afflicted with doubts concerning his gifts as a ruler, but in one respect at least, that of a faithful economist, he was resolved to shine. He took a very serious view of his responsibilities towards the national finances, and in these matters his judgment was rarely at fault. Bülow-Cummerow's proposals were rejected; the bank president gained a victory over the minister for finance. For the time being, the perplexing question whether the issue of bank notes to the amount of ten million thalers would not involve an illegal increase in the national debt was left unsettled. Now that the state had ceased to be the sole owner of the bank, reasons of almost equal cogency could be found either for an affirmative or for a negative answer. It had become obvious that an unambiguous settlement was essential to put an end to the confusions prevailing in Prussian constitutional law. On April 11, 1846, a cabinet order was issued decreeing the reorganisation of the Bank of Prussia, essentially in accordance with Rother's proposals, and on October 5th the new bank

[1] Kühne's Memoirs.

ordinance was promulgated. Rother had the pleasure of witnessing the way in which his notes secured acceptance everywhere, both at home and abroad, with the same facility as hard cash. Even during the storms of the year 1848, they continued to circulate tranquilly at par.

After such a defeat it was impossible for Flottwell to retain office. How cruel had been the fate of this distinguished official amid the vicissitudes of the new government. First of all, as a reward of his exemplary administration, the king had transferred him from Posen to Magdeburg. Flottwell, despite his protests that he had no expert knowledge, had then been appointed minister for finance, and had subsequently received repeated assurances of the king's undiminished confidence.[1] It was now plain that Flottwell's doubts had been justified. He fancied, however, that he could save himself by a bold step. In a memorial issued in June, 1846, he recommended the monarch to reconstitute the ministry so that the bank and all the monetary institutions of the state should be placed under the control of the minister for finance. Commerce and industry, mines and the postal service, on the other hand, were to be assigned to a new ministry for commerce. These changes were, he said, requisite, because in the existing posture of affairs the minister for finance was "annihilated." Here was a plain declaration of war against Rother, whose plans the king had just approved. Frederick William was extremely angry, for he considered the minister's conduct criminally recalcitrant. In July, Flottwell was ungraciously dismissed, and he might deem himself lucky when he was subsequently appointed lord lieutenant of Westphalia.[2]

The post of minister for finance was thus vacated for the third time subsequent to Frederick William's accession. Since Kühne, who seemed more likely than anyone else to be successful as fourth incumbent of the position, was a persona ingrata to the monarch, after long consideration Count Arnim-Boitzenburg who had received his congé in the previous year, was asked to accept this office. The count responded, as Flottwell had done, that he knew nothing about finance. The king's persistence induced him at length to waive this objection, but he thereupon candidly declared that he could

[1] Bodelschwingh to Flottwell, January 26, 1845.

[2] Flottwell to Thile, July 6; Thile, Report to the king, July 6, Memorial concerning the memorial of the minister for finance, July 22, 1846.

not overcome his objections to the king's plans for a constitution and would be unable to defend them before the impending diet.[1] After this declaration he had become impossible. In the end, therefore, the appointment was conferred upon Privy Councillor von Duesberg, who had been the first to take charge of the Catholic department. He was an able lawyer, but no financier.

Merchants and manufacturers in general were by no means satisfied with the reform of the Bank of Prussia, if only for the reason that the bank had as yet few branches in the provinces. Fritz Harkort estimated that in Westphalia the annual turnover in the five leading sections of industry was sixteen million thalers (the figure was unquestionably too low); and this province, with a population of nearly fifteen hundred thousand, had but three small banks, in Münster and in Schwelm, so that most of its banking business had to be done in Cologne. Harkort spoke and wrote on behalf of a private bank for his homeland. Visiting Berlin in 1845, he discussed the question with manufacturers from Silesia, Posen, and Rhineland; but the government, which was about to reorganise its own bank, would hear nothing of the matter. There was growing up a new class of capitalists and creditors of the state. Rodbertus-Jagetzow, the brilliant political economist, therefore proposed the foundation of a great bank with its head office in Berlin and with many branches. The capital was to be provided, half by free subscriptions, and half by the provinces. A gigantic speculative undertaking now showed that the traditional and over-cautious banking policy could no longer be sustained. In Dessau, Schulte of Cologne endeavoured to found a huge banking concern with a capital of one hundred million thalers, subsequently increased to two hundred million thalers, issuing notes to the same amount. Inasmuch as the contentious little land of Anhalt-Dessau had been wont since the days of the Coethen tariff war to practise neighbourly exploitation upon the environing territory of Prussia, the Dessau court approved the proposal, and was extremely mortified when Prussia refused to permit the establishment of any branches of the undertaking. Subsequently this wonderful Dessau bank shrank to become a mere provincial bank with a capital of two and a half million thalers. But the king was not blind to the signs of the times.

[1] Count Arnim to Thile, July 14, 15, and 30; Arnim to the king, July 30 and August 8; Cabinet Order to Arnim, August 3, 1846.

In approving the new bank ordinance, he simultaneously commissioned Rother to elaborate a legislative proposal concerning private banks. But the old man's energy was unequal to the task. Rother could not make himself at home in the new commercial conditions, and, despite the abuse lavished on him by Schön as a companion of Jews, he had an invincible dread of the dangers of banking speculation. He absolutely refused to tolerate private banks of issue, and if a banking company should receive permission to carry on bill of exchange and deposit business, no second bank of the kind was to be established within five miles [German]. It was impossible that these timid proposals should meet the needs of the case, and the revolution was soon to march inexorably over them.

Nor would Rother permit any further changes in the management of the Oversea Trading Company, the institution which he had in former days rescued from its difficulties. The bank was intended to provide for the monetary intercourse of the mercantile world, whereas the function of the Oversea Trading Company was to attend to the monetary affairs of the state, and it did excellent service in this respect, for it saved the state from dependence upon the costly indirect cooperation of the great banking houses. It had been Rother's special service that the brothers Rothschild continued to look askance at the Prussian state as an almost unapproachable client. In accordance with Frederician tradition, the Oversea Trading Company, besides carrying on the business of a state banking house, likewise conducted an extensive marine commerce, so that Rother congratulated himself upon its ownership of five splendid vessels, which were admired in every port of the world. In addition, the company owned several landed estates and factories. But the capital locked up in these undertakings did not bring in much return, and the banking business was hampered by investments of the kind, for banking capital must always be extremely fluid. If the Oversea Trading Company were to rise to the occasion, if it were to become entirely competent to fulfil its new duties as state banking house, it must not hesitate, regardless of its old name, to abandon its shipping business and its manufacturing enterprises. Rother could not bring himself to agree to so radical a reform. The last living representative of the officials of the Hardenberg school, he stood at the threshold of a new age, but was afraid to enter the portal. Yet by his bank ordinance he had himself

thrown wide the door. Within ten years, the Bank of Prussia, after a further increase in its capital, had become one of the great banks of Europe, though without any further change in its constitution. To this very day, the German Imperial Bank is founded upon the cooperation of state authority with private enterprise. Rother was not like Motz a man of creative intelligence, but he was an extremely able man of business, and his activities in his chosen field have secured for him an honourable place in the history of German officialdom.

The wounds of the years of war were at length soundly healed, and industry was everywhere making more rapid progress than during the two previous decades. In Prussia, from the time of the issue of the new customs law down to the death of the late king, the number of forges for blacksmiths, nailsmiths, and cutlers had increased from 59,000 to 79,000, and the number of looms for cotton and half-cotton goods had increased from 14,000 to 49,000. During the first nine years of the new reign the steam engines used at Berlin factories had increased from 29 with a total horse-power of 392, to 193 with a total horse-power of 1,265, whilst during thirteen years the numbers of the metal workers in Berlin had advanced from 3,000 to 4,500. Step by step German industry endeavoured to make up for the great start secured by foreign countries. When the Berlin-Anhalt railway was established, the company ordered fifteen locomotives from England, and only six from the engineering firm of Borsig. But Borsig, with the aid of his well-trained employees who regarded themselves as the aristocracy of the Berlinese workers, did his utmost, and in the decade which followed 1842 he supplied the railway with nineteen locomotives, whilst no more than sixteen in all were procured from England and Belgium. Simultaneously, the Germans were undertaking the supply of other railway requisites, now that Caspar Harkort had succeeded in making railway carriage wheels at the Hagen iron works.

But the seamy side of these mighty new developments was speedily to become apparent. Our pride had ever been our sturdy peasantry, men well fitted to bear arms. As compared with Great Britain, Germany had nearly three times the proportion of arable land and only one-sixth of the amount of unproductive soil, for in Great Britain the landed gentry had for the most part dispossessed the peasants of their holdings.

The distribution of the population in town and country respectively was tolerably equable, and for this reason German life still preserved traits of primitive energy and innocent freshness which were practically unknown to the urban civilisations of Germany's southern and western neighbours. But in our land, too, there now began, slowly at first but making inexorable progress, the migration to the towns. In Breslau, within a brief period, a new quarter came into existence round the railway stations. Factories sprang up in Hamburg, in Stettin, in Leipzig, and even in quiet Dresden, where, for the sake of foreign visitors, factory chimneys were looked upon with disfavour. The haste, the eager search for enjoyment, and the discontent characteristic of urban life, became widely diffused among the little provincial towns and throughout the rural districts. How utterly, too, were all habits of life transformed by the large-scale production of the youthful manufacturing industry. Many of the most noted discoveries, especially in the textile industry, were utterly useless, serving merely to promote over-production, fierce competitive struggles, and restless changes of fashion. The old broadcloth which the thrifty burgher would turn yet another time after four years' wear, passed out of use, but the elegant and inexpensive modern material which replaced it would seldom outlast the season. The Düsseldorf painter had long ceased to know what his pigments were made of. The manufacturers supplied him with splendid colours, but when they faded with incredible speed, or when the varnish peeled off, he could not but envy the simpler old masters, who prepared their pigments for themselves and could therefore paint confidently for posterity. The author, similarly, could cheerfully anticipate that in a century his works, cheaply and rapidly printed upon thin and smooth machine-made paper, would be literally unreadable.

Short-lived and fugitive was everything produced by the new industry, and it was inevitable that this perishableness of economic products should react upon the whole philosophy of the age. None but rare and strong spirits will ever be animated by the great ambition of creating not for an age but for all time, yet hardly ever before in history had the doctrine that man lives for to-day been enunciated with such self-complacency as during the latter half of the nineteenth century. With manifold variations, the radical literature of the period harped upon the same essential theme, insisting

that the day of the cumbrous old erudition had passed, that the free modern consciousness could secure expression solely in the facile form of journalism, and that those only to whom the aroma of the newspaper damp from the press seemed like the fresh air of morning could hope to stand in the foremost ranks of time. A new generation was growing up, a generation of persons who hurried from place to place, from one impression to the next, learning quickly and forgetting more quickly still, incessantly enjoying, incessantly acquisitive, in love with themselves and with the present, but in truth lacking both peace and joy. In Germany there were at first but scattered indications of this commencing transformation in social life. The power of material interests was still strongly counteracted by the lofty idealism of the struggle for political unity; and it was not until much later, when the national longing had reached its goal, that in Central Europe, too, an epoch dominated by acquisitiveness and the lust for enjoyment was to ensue.

In the altered circumstances, grave mischief was worked to the German home and to its guardian, woman. Since the Thirty Years' War, and also in earlier days, there had during our eventful history been several periods wherein women had stood at a loftier altitude than men, and wherein men, ensavaged by circumstances, had been restored to civilisation through the excellence of home life. But now had come days when women found it more difficult than did men to adapt themselves to a changed world, and when women were ceasing to understand their natural mission. The traditional and thrifty domestic economy, in accordance with which the well regulated burgher household was always furnished with abundant supplies to outlast the winter season, was now out of the question, for feminine domestic labour had lost meaning and value when linen and outer clothing could be bought in any shop. The patriarchal relationship between the rulers of the household and their servants had perished, for the servant class, too, was seized with the migratory impulse of the age. Thus women were deprived of a considerable proportion of their wonted tranquil activities, and discontent seized them in a half aimless life. Since, moreover, in the upper classes marriage was rendered difficult by the fall in the purchasing power of money and by the greater complications in the way of securing a livelihood, there was a continual increase in the

number of dissatisfied, sickly, and nervous women. The world was hopelessly perplexed by a "woman's question" which had been unknown to our simpler forefathers. With amateurish eagerness women pushed themselves into masculine occupations, and just as had happened of old during the moral corruption of classical antiquity, so now from the slime of hyperculture there emerged the doctrines of the emancipation of women.

Although the general level of wealth still remained extremely modest, a few giant fortunes had already come into existence at an unnaturally early date. The riches of the house of Rothschild exceeded anything that the Roman empire had known in the way of unhealthy accumulations of capital. It was part of the very nature of the new large-scale industry that merely in order to exist it had continually to strive for expansion. The state, whose life invariably runs a slower course than that of society, had long been unable to keep pace with the transformations of social life. Hardenberg and Hoffmann, when a quarter of a century earlier with patriarchal solicitude they had imposed the new taxes upon an impoverished people, had never dreamed of the possibility of such fortunes as now sprang up in a single night. In the wealthy city of Cologne, during the year 1845, there were only five firms which paid the maximum business tax of 260 thalers, and among these were the well-known banking houses of Salomon, Oppenheim & Schaaffhausen. The largest of the two Rhenish steamship companies paid no more than 91 thalers. In relation to the magnitude of extant fortunes, the very highest exactions of the graduated income tax, being extremely modest, seemed like mockery, and people in a small way of business were naturally indignant at the preference thus shown to great wealth. The new powers in the world of capital showed nothing of that freehandedness—magnanimous, keenly interested in the common weal, loving to adorn whole cities, and therefore reconciling social contrasts—which had characterised the wealthy in the days of classical antiquity, and had indeed been imposed upon the wealthy by the national civilisation. Not only did they make a relentless use of their superiority in the market, but, in defiance of the law, they were already beginning to conspire against the forces of labour. The day was at hand when the Bonn-Cologne railway company and the Leipzig-Dresden railway company were to blacklist undesirable workmen.

The beginnings of an international combination of the great money powers were already discernible. In the middle ages the German and the French chivalry had at times made common cause against the bourgeoisie. In the sixteenth century the religious factions of every country had unhesitatingly appealed to those of their own faith in other lands to help them in the fight against such of their countrymen as held a different creed. It was the glory of recent history that the peculiarities of nationality were everywhere undergoing a vigorous and conscious development, that national differences were by degrees becoming more important than differences in politics, in class, or in religion. The peculiar greatness of modern civilisation lay in the multiplicity of its national structures. This healthy and natural evolution suffered of a sudden disastrous reversal. The stock-exchange powers of all civilised countries began to come to a tacit understanding concerning their common monetary interests, and the new international party of great capital secured its appropriate props from sanspatrie Jewry. One of the leaders of the European Jews, Crémieux of Paris, a radical deputy, was already triumphantly announcing what gigantic strides forward Israel had taken; and in 1847 Toussenel, the French ultramontane, published his admonitory work *Les Juifs rois de l'époque.* The work was comparatively worthless, being full of vain assumptions, but it at least served to show that its fanatical author had considerable skill as a weather prophet.

The workers were almost helpless in face of the massed powers of capital. It is true that in Germany large-scale industry was still in its initial stages, so that the social contrasts in our land were far less gross than in France or England. The despairing war cry of the French workers, "Let us die fighting or live working," did not as yet find any echo in Germany. But complaints were already rife concerning starvation wages, child labour, and the maltreatment and exploitation of the workpeople. Many German manufacturers had introduced the abominable English truck system, whereby the employees were paid in goods. When Wolff of Breslau, writing in 1843, described the miseries of the poor in the "casemates" or working-class tenements of his native city, Germans recognised with horror that their own land now possessed warrens of infamy rivalling the "rue de la misère" or the "impasse des cloaques" in Paris. Members of the possess-

ing classes were still almost completely devoid of sympathy for the feelings of the masses. Many a manufacturer of the Erzgebirge would relate without a qualm that in the recently built working-class barracks his hands reproduced their kind by incest. In these places folk might live in concubinage as they pleased, for the indulgent authorities would not harry them. The abyss that yawned between the heights and the depths of society was crudely displayed by the fate of the stories of village life. The authors of these works, which were conceived in a spirit entirely friendly to the common people, one and all lived through the tragi-comical experience of discovering that their books remained quite incomprehensible to common folk for the reason that these, when they could read German, could read it only in manuscript. Poverty and inertia opposed an almost insuperable barrier to the educational efforts of the state authority. After many years of hard work, all that the Prussian educational administration had been able to effect was that in Posen 61 per cent. and in Rhineland 80 per cent. of the children of school age actually attended school. In the province of Saxony, where conditions were somewhat better, the percentage attendance was 93. But the neglect of childhood was especially deplorable in the great manufacturing towns. In Elberfeld only 79 per cent. of the children, and in Aix-la-Chapelle no more than 37 per cent., were at school.

To the king it seemed that the protection of the lower classes of his subjects was a sacred Christian duty. He was far from having any bias in favour of wealthy capitalists, and he frequently pondered the question whether in his proposed united diets he ought not to give the operatives a special class representation. He was delighted when in Berlin, after the industrial exhibition of 1844, there was founded a "Society to Promote the Welfare of the Working Classes"; and he gave considerable pecuniary support to this body, which aimed at establishing savings banks, at founding schools, and at circulating useful literature. In many other large towns similar societies were formed. The watchword of the pious court was, Be charitable to the poor. Unfortunately, however, the monarch had no knowledge of practical life, whilst his officials, on the other hand, held almost without exception that the growth of large-scale manufacturing industry was tantamount to the advance of civilisation, and they shrank

from doing anything which might hamper capitalist enterprise. As yet hardly anyone ventured to think of effective factory inspection. In 1843, when the provincial diets of Rhineland and Westphalia petitioned for a law against the truck system, the reply of the crown was that in case of need such a law would be passed, but it seemed extremely "dubious" whether the legislator could afford any protection in these matters "without endangering the existence of the operatives, especially in seasons of bad trade, by undue interference with the conditions of private life." The naïve hope was, however, expressed that "the usurious conduct of certain factory owners will cease once and for all as soon as it has been stigmatised by public opinion."

In England the workers had long ere this secured the right of association, but in Germany, thanks to the timidities of the bureaucracy, this right was universally withheld. Sharked together from all quarters, homeless and yet strictly tied by conditions of place and time, isolated, without any definite social status, without sense of comradeship, and without delight in the product of their labour (for these unthinking slaves of the machine could not, as could every simple handicraftsman, look with pride upon the work of their hands), but imperfectly protected here and there by the newly constituted factory courts—the operatives were entirely at the mercy of their powerful employers, who would pay only the stipulated wage, from which deductions were often enough made in virtue of arbitrarily imposed contracts. In defiance of the law, these oppressed wretches would at times attempt to better their condition by means of strikes, as was done by the cotton weavers in Berlin and by the railway workers at Brandenburg and Vohwinkel.

In the rural districts of the north-east, unwholesome social conditions had become apparent now that the two-edged effects of the legislation of Stein and Hardenberg had begun to make themselves felt. How confidently had Hardenberg, at the opening of his plan for a constitution, penned the words, "We have nothing but free proprietorship." How hopefully had Sack spoken of "the second and the third Pomerania," which were to be brought into being by the settlement of free peasants. Yet how differently had everything worked out. It was true that the middle class of the rural districts had gained considerably by the agrarian legisla-

tion. The peasants were now individually free; the manorial taxes were no longer imposed upon them; after ceding part of their property they had become free owners. When the price of grain recovered, many of them were well-to-do, especially the peasants on the old domains, whose situation was peculiarly favourable. Quite a number of them were wealthier than the neighbouring lords of the manor, and had begun, like these, to cultivate their lands in accordance with the principles of the new agriculture. The owners of the smaller farms, on the other hand, the peasants who had no teams, were by the declaration of May 29, 1816, excluded from the regulation edict, for the crown had been afraid lest the great landowners, already hard hit by the war, should be utterly ruined if they were deprived of their ordinary supply of manual labour.[1] Since landed property could now be alienated, the traditional and valuable protection of the peasantry no longer existed, and the legislators can hardly have foreseen what devastation the freedom of sale was to work among the poorer peasantry. The majority of the lesser peasant farms were gradually absorbed, and whereas in former days the peasants, crofters, cotters, and agricultural labourers, combined to form a single estate of peasant serfs, the rural population now gradually underwent segregation into two classes.

Far beneath the peasants there existed henceforward a rural proletariat of free wage-labourers, persons whose economic status was utterly insecure. The semi-free petty serf of earlier days had been bound to the soil, but had possessed the right of cultivating the soil; he shared in the communal privileges, and the lord of the manor would at times give him a helping hand. The new wage-labourers had little land or none at all. Even when the communal lands were partitioned, the poorer peasants went empty away, for their communal rights had been no more than customary, without legal foundation. They bitterly complained: "The richer peasants are now made into noblemen, but we have become beggars." Moreover, among the country-folk, as elsewhere, there prevailed that craving for personal independence which dominated the entire century as if by an irresistible natural force. The general mass of cotters and of the completely landless labourers increased far more rapidly than did the number of the wage-earners settled on the manorial estates,

[1] See vol. IV, pp. 156 and 157; vol. VI, pp. 78 and 79.

for though these latter were often much better cared for, men were unwilling to contract for long terms of service. Meanwhile the distilling of potato spirit and the sugar-beet industry were rapidly gaining ground, and distiller's wash soon became indispensable for large-scale agriculture on a dry and sandy soil. In these new agricultural branches of industry, the sufferings of the workmen were often greater than those of their fellows in the urban factories. The wage-earner felt unsupported and isolated in modern society, now that patriarchal landlordism no longer existed, while he had no share in the deliberations of the village commune. But the countryman has a tenacious memory. The long vanished days when in the teeming forests anyone who wished might load his cart with wood, remained unforgotten throughout Germany, and no dweller in the country-side could ever understand why forest thefts should be punished like any other crime. Again, the members of the new class of free wage-earners were well aware that their forefathers had once tilled plots of land for their own use. They had an obscure sense of injustice, and in actual fact they were the victims of a kind of political thinking which had grown out of date. No one can wholly escape the limitations of his own time. The valuable reforms of Stein and Hardenberg were, after all, rooted in the philosophy of the eighteenth century, which, when it spoke of the people, thought only of the middle classes and had little knowledge of the working masses. Since in the country the ownership of land is the one and only desideratum, a definite aim was furnished for the wishes of the murmuring wage-earners, and when the revolution broke out, there rose like a cry of nature from all lips the demand: "The king must grant us land."

Amid such disastrous economic conditions, the doctrines of social destruction throve like maggots in carrion. The communist party, whose focus of activities was abroad, but which was already despatching secret emissaries to all parts of Germany, now openly proclaimed its cosmopolitan designs, demanding universal social revolution, just as the great money powers were already spinning their webs from land to land. The golden international and the red international, as they were termed at a later date, were in process of organisation. The communists formally renounced connection with political radicalism, although their own doctrine had originally sprung

from that source. They despised "the seed of Hambach"; they ridiculed the "constitutionalist eldorado" and derided the notion of German unity; even Fein, the unprincipled demagogue who had recently published Schön's *Whence and Whither?* was contemptuously classed by them among the "liberal amphibia." Weitling, the tailor, had great influence with the German manual workers in Switzerland. Another successful agitator in this part of the world was Schmidt, the Swabian leather-dresser. Both these men had relations with Cabet, who had written so moving a description of the promised land of Icaria, a cooperative commonwealth where there was a lake of lemonade. They founded numerous revolutionary working men's associations, and confidently anticipated that henceforward year by year six hundred communist manual workers would return from Switzerland to Germany to diffuse the doctrines in the fatherland. Bakunin now made his appearance in these circles, a Russian of aristocratic birth who excelled all other demagogues of the day in unscrupulous revolutionary activities.

Weitling continued his literary labours, publishing among other incendiary works *The Poor Sinner's Gospel*, a blasphemous book recalling the writings of the anabaptists, and serving to show once again how closely intertwined in the communist dreams are world-contemning idealism and vulgar sensuality. The doctrine of the community of goods was misapplied to justify the social revolution and even ordinary theft; Jesus was depicted as a man of pleasure; the divine power of love, which led our Saviour to forgive Mary Magdalen, was transformed into a charter for every kind of unchastity. In all seriousness, the fanatical tailor expected to secure the approval of Lamennais who in the name of God had for years been attacking existing society as the work of Satan, and Weitling was painfully disillusioned when the Catholic socialist indignantly declared that he would have nothing to do with this grotesque caricature of gospel truth. Before long the Swiss took alarm. They had willingly tolerated the refugees' inflammatory denunciations of the princes, but attacks upon property were repugnant to their sense of thrift and orderliness. Fierce onslaughts upon the "German ragamuffins" appeared in the newspapers, and in 1843 Weitling was expelled from the Confederation. Bluntschli, the liberal-conservative, commissioned by the canton of Zurich, then wrote a thoughtful

report upon the communists in Switzerland. But the chief upshot of the publication of this memorial was to diffuse a knowledge of the doings of the anarchists. During the ensuing months, about three hundred German manual workers joined the communist club in Paris, and Moses Hess, one of their leaders, actually penned a mocking address in which he thanked the Zurich jurist for having gained so many new adherents to the good cause.[1]

In Switzerland meanwhile another "Young German" group had been constituted, and for the third time this name assumed a fugitive importance. A working-class association, it had almost as little in common with the movement initiated by Mazzini and his friends as with the Young Germany of the men of letters. Expressly renouncing nationalist ideas, its primary aim was to shake the faith of the masses in the existing order, and above all to shake their faith in religion. The only adherent who had belonged to the older group of conspirators was Harro Harring, the poet. Like all the comrades, he wore a workman's smock, and he sang:

> Cast down Mammon's altars. Its supports thus withdrawn,
> The throne will assuredly totter and fall.

The new leaders were without exception persons of little account. Among them may be mentioned Döleke, a pupil of Ruge in philosophical matters; a locksmith named Standau; Kuhlmann, a bearded prophet of solemn mien; a windbag named Marr, a clerk from Hamburg who, after his expulsion from Switzerland, wrote a lengthy work recounting his heroic deeds in that country. But despite the insignificance of the chiefs, the demagogues secured widespread support, for the associative spirit, which is so deeply rooted in the German nature, and which could no longer find satisfaction in the decayed guilds and was denied an outlet in the new factory life, secured expression in the communist clubs. At their evening meetings for debates and readings the workmen displayed an estimable impulse towards culture, but how shamefully was this impulse misguided by the apostles of "anarchism," men who renounced the state and every kind of social order. Marr himself gave the name of anarchism to his doctrine. Its atheistic principles were derived from Feuerbach's *Philosophy of the Future*, a work which could not fail to charm the half-

[1] Count Arnim's Report, Paris, September 26, 1843.

cultured by the beauty of its style and by the idealistic inclinations of its author, a man of far from ignoble character.

The leaders of the Swiss anarchists were supplied with secret instructions from Paris by Dr. Ewerbeck.[1] On the Seine there now existed a nest of communist secret societies most of which were offshoots from the Society of the Rights of Man. Vanished now was the religious enthusiasm of the Saint-Simonians, and long outgrown had been their idealistic demand, "To everyone according to his capacity, to every capacity according to its performances." Those of the younger generation bluntly insisted, "To everyone according to his needs"; and it was only the milder spirits among them that were contented with the ambiguous demand for "the organisation of labour." Since under the bourgeois monarchy the moneybags were all-powerful, and since by the *charte* political rights were reserved for persons with a high property qualification, it was inevitable that the radical opposition should direct its attacks against property itself. A fierce hatred for the possessing classes animated all these parties, whether they termed themselves Cabetists, equalitarians, or reformers. The French characteristics of the movement were signalised by the fact that the name "bourgeoisie" had long since become a term of abuse, whereas in Germany, despite all the invectives of the radicals, its counterpart "Bürgertum" was still an honourable designation. Blinded by doctrinairism, Guizot was unable to read the signs of an imminent and terrible social revolution. He believed the populace to be contented because he could always reckon with certainty upon the votes of the servile majority in the chamber, upon the support of the "pays légal." He even went so far as to deny that there was a fourth estate, seeing that his beloved tiers état had no legally prescribed lower limit. The ministry of the interior, no less self-satisfied than the premier, assured the Prussian envoy that the doctrines of Proudhon, Cabet, and Constant had little hold upon the airy and positivist French mind. The German workmen were more receptive for these doctrines, for they had a penchant for humanist and philosophical speculation, and they were still influenced by the teachings of the anabaptists and the illuminates. The French police had little detailed information to give concerning the

[1] Despatch to the Prussian envoy Count Arnim, from Delessart, prefect of police in Paris, May 16, 1845.

German communist league. The report ran that the body contained a few hundred members, among whom were many Jews, and in especial skilled workmen, such as compositors, machinists, and ivory turners. As regards place of origin, Electoral Saxony, Thuringia, and the Palatinate were strongly represented.[1]

Some of the German men of letters who had flocked to Paris, Ruge, Marx, Börnstein, Bernays, Hess, and Heine, founded at this juncture a periodical named *Vorwärts*, a journal of international radicalism. Significantly enough, with the exception of Ruge all the members of this group were Jews. *Vorwärts* published several of the most obscene of Heine's *Poems of the Time*; both in verse and prose it extolled Tschech, the regicide; for the king of Prussia it discovered a new name, Knäs of Russia, and the absurdity of this designation speedily secured its acceptance by the whole radical world. The newspaper was suppressed by Guizot after a very few issues. Nor did the members of the staff hold together for long. When Heine had a chance encounter with Weitling, and was hailed by the tailor as a good comrade, the poet felt profoundly humiliated "by the journeyman's greeting of the unbelieving philistine." In reality the philistine was a better believer than the poet, who merely played brilliantly with his convictions. But Heine's artistic sensibilities made it impossible for him to endure contact with the dregs of society, and ere long he discreetly withdrew from these associations. Ruge, too, took fright when he realised the ultimate aims of the Parisian fellowship. How many viewpoints had the high priest of the young Hegelians transcended one after another with his clamorous dialectic. Yet though he himself was a poor man, he never got beyond the outlook of the independent individuality and its right of ownership. His blunt Pomeranian good sense and the scrupulousness of the old Burschenschafter saved him from the worst doctrines of the extremists, and as soon as he had seen through his erstwhile associates, with his wonted pugnacity he stigmatised "the folly of the theories and the filthiness of the mind of Rabbi Moses Hess." Even Heinzen, of all the demagogues the most gifted in the art of abuse,

[1] Renseignements sur le communisme allemand, elaborated in the police section of the ministry of the interior, sent to Berlin by Count Arnim on June 17, 1845.

refused to follow the communists when they wished to draw the logical conclusions from his own doctrines. Political radicalism and social radicalism had reached the parting of the ways.

The most effective support came to the communists from England. The working classes of that country, shamefully oppressed, had initiated the great chartist movement as early as 1835. The demands of the charter primarily concerned political rights, such as universal suffrage and similar matters. But everyone knew that the celebrated "six points" were looked upon merely as means for completely revolutionising economic life, and within three years Stephens, the methodist preacher, uttered the decisive word when he said: "Chartism is a knife-and-fork question." In the Workers' Marseillaise of the chartists, maledictions were invoked upon King Steam, "the tyrant whom the white slave knows." Wishing to study at the source the power and the baseness of modern large-scale industry, Friedrich Engels from Rhineland (next to Marx the ablest of the German communists) visited London, and subsequently wrote *The Condition of the Working Classes in England.* This book, published in 1843, though not free from partisan exaggerations, is brilliant, exhaustive, and essentially true to life. Its drastic descriptions of unspeakable poverty are profoundly affecting. It concludes with the prophecy of an imminent social revolution, which was unquestionably threatening in England, but was happily averted by the strong self-preservative impulse of the ancient and firmly established state system. Not long afterwards Engels and Marx joined the great international working men's league which had been founded in London by Schapper, another German, and had since then grown greatly in numbers.[1] By this time Marx had gone so far as to reject religion, the state, law, and all ordinances whether human or divine. Early in 1848 the two friends jointly drafted the *Manifesto of the Communist Party,* which demanded in so many words the overthrow of society, the expropriation of landlords, and the abolition of inheritance. "We support every revolutionary movement," declared the writers. Their essential teaching was summed up in the phrase: "Proletarians of all countries, unite!" The programme of international revolution had been formulated, and its originators were two sanspatrie Germans.

[1] See vol. VI, page 139.

The German learned world first had its attention directed to this movement in 1844, when Lorenz Stein, a native of Schleswig-Holstein, published his excellent *Socialism and Communion in Contemporary France.* The great mass of the reading public, however, could not digest so cumbrous a book, written in a scholastic style. The ordinary reader demanded lighter fare, and he found it in the *Gesellschaftsspiegel,* which Moses Hess, the Rhenish Jew, who had now been expelled from Paris, issued for a time in the pious Wupper valley. "An organ for the representation of the propertiless classes," the newspaper considered that free competition was "the only cause of all our troubles." Side by side with much inflammatory radical froth, it published descriptions of the factory life of the western provinces, descriptions that were only too true. In the *Westphalische Dampfboot,* O. Lüning, and in the *Triersche Zeitung,* Carl Grün, who had been expelled from Baden, wrote in similar strain. Throughout the native province of Marx and Engels, the thought of the social revolution was widely diffused, and to all appearance the communists had a secret press in Cologne. The censors, however, were more lenient towards the organs of West German socialism than towards the journals of the political opposition. They failed to realise how common folk were interpreting the slightly veiled adulations of community of goods.

Even among the wealthy Rhenish bourgeoisie, popularly known as "the Cologne clique," there still prevailed here and there a lukewarm and purely theoretical fondness for social radicalism. When it was proposed to found in Cologne a "Society to promote the Welfare of the Working Classes," modelled upon that of Berlin, Assessor Jung, who had been on the staff of the suppressed *Rheinische Zeitung,* declared that the name was offensive, for, he said, "We are all workers" —a contention which sounded strange in the mouth of this spoiled child of pleasure. He suggested the name "General Society for Assistance and Culture." During the discussions the catchwords of the communist journals were so freely voiced that Ludolf Camphausen and several other moderate liberals hastened to withdraw. Working men's clubs in which the self-assertion of the young fourth estate secured vigorous expression, were founded in Berlin, Hamburg, Kiel, and Magdeburg. In addition, in all the great towns, there were secret societies, where communist writings were read aloud. On

all hands, too, there were to be found persons who disclosed themselves to adepts as emissaries of Marianne of Paris or other foreign secret societies. Doubtless the full extent of this widely ramified subterranean intrigue will ever remain obscure, but how successfully it was conducted was proved by the success of the barricade fights during the year of revolution. Moreover, the poets of the day, Freiligrath, Wilhelm Jordan, and Carl Beck now referred more frequently in their verses to social misery than to the struggle for political freedom. Alfred Meissner, the German Bohemian, wrote the plaint :

> For gold and doxies they are questing,
> Hounds and horses, mansions, feasting—
> What irks the poor is lack of bread.

Far more widely diffused were bad translations from the French, the most recent products of the Gallic imagination, a compost of filth and blood. The worldly wisdom of this social literature was comprehensible to persons with the smallest modicum of intelligence. All that was necessary was to turn the old ideas topsy-turvy, and to say, God is sin, marriage is unchastity, property is theft. *The Wandering Jew* and *The Mysteries of Paris,* by Eugène Sue, were widely read in Germany, thousands of minds being poisoned by the nauseating descriptions of the soft-hearted throat-slitter, the virtuous prostitutes, the honest guttersnipes, and the cruel usurer. Louis Blanc's *History of Ten Years,* of which three separate translations were published within a twelvemonth, had an almost equal charm for the German mind. Blanc was a man of mediocre intelligence, but a skilful narrator. Despite his poverty in ideas he was competent to give a vivid description of the money power of the bourgeoisie, to portray so movingly their faults and their hard-heartedness that readers were naturally led to seek consolation in the vague fancy picture of a future organisation of society, where each could fill in the details according to individual taste. Lamartine, too, though an opponent of the radicals, thoughtlessly furthered the cause of the revolutionary party. His *History of the Girondins* adorned the odious prose of the revolutionary struggles with all the charms of poetic description, idolising political crime with a sentimentality which was far more congenial to the half-educated among the

Germans than was serious history as penned by Niebuhr, Carlyle, or Dahlmann.

Whilst social discord was being thus actively promoted by countless agents and in countless writings, Germany was beginning to know the meaning here and there of terrible poverty. During the year 1847 there were in Berlin ten thousand recipients of charity, and thirty thousand persons subject to police supervision, at a time when the number of the fully independent and efficient burghers was reckoned at no more than twenty thousand. After the great floods of the year 1845, and a succession of bad harvests, poverty was chronic in East Prussia. Minister Flottwell did his utmost to relieve the distress of his beloved native province, and in course of time more than a million thalers were devoted to this purpose, but with little effect, owing to the lack of coordination.

In the Silesian mountains the weavers, stricken with despair, ventured upon open revolt. The guild system had not prevailed in this occupation, and occupational freedom, therefore, had not directly affected it. But indirect harm had resulted, for since the reform there had been a great increase in the number of the free weavers working at home at their own looms; there had likewise been an increase in the number of merchants and manufacturers; and owing to the keenness of competition the capitalists displayed a hardheartedness which seemed positively demoniacal in people ordinarily so good-natured. Terrible was the force of inertia among these devitalised and despairing workers. The weavers frequently resisted the introduction of improved working methods; they found it very difficult to change their way of livelihood and to undertake wage-earning occupations; they made extensive depredations in the beetroot and potato fields on neighbouring estates; and they refused to leave their heavily mortgaged cottages, even when it was possible for them to live better and cheaper elsewhere. The avaricious merchants preferred to buy their wares at starvation prices from the home workers, rather than from a well-ordered factory. The king's heart was torn when, during his visits to Erdmannsdorff, he learned something, though far too little, of the prevailing poverty. At his instigation, here and elsewhere in the mountains, great spinning mills were established by the Oversea Trading Company, wherein many unfortunates found employment. In Breslau

Counts Dyhrn, York, Zieten, and the author Gustav Freytag, founded a benevolent society, which soon had numerous local branches throughout the province. But all these efforts availed nothing in face of the widespread distress. Lord Lieutenant Merckel and his advisers in the provincial government were simply unable to see that poverty existed. Being absolutely convinced of the saving force of economic natural laws, being certain that the play of supply and demand would spontaneously relieve all suffering, they actually suspected the Breslau benevolent society of harmful designs. Their suspicions were not allayed until the society was judicious enough to appeal for military aid, and to elect Count Brandenburg, general in command of the forces of the province, a member of the committee. It was really astounding to note the way in which these old officials, trained in the school of the civil code, had completely forgotten that the Frederican state had been based upon a monarchical organisation of labour, and that the code itself had expressly recognised the right to work.

In the spring of 1844 a new popular song could be heard in all the larger weaving villages of the mountain region. *The Bloody Assize* ran:

> Unfeeling scoundrels, hellish brood,
> Satan is sure your lord.
> Gluttons who eat the poor man's food,
> His curse is your reward!

On a certain day in the month of June the offices of the firm of Zwanziger in Peterswaldau were demolished by the weavers. For two entire days the enraged populace devastated the factories of the neighbourhood, destroying everywhere, but rarely plundering. It was nothing but the frenzy of poverty which misled the rioters. These poor fellows whose chill rooms were lighted in the evening with a burning pine-splinter, had never read a word of the communists' writings. Too late did Merckel recognise how false had been his estimate of the situation. He hastened to the spot. The troops restored order, though not without bloodshed; eighty-three persons were arrested; the ringleaders were severely punished. The crown now despatched a special commissioner, Privy Councillor von Minutoli, to study the prevailing destitution. More spinning mills were founded by the Oversea Trading Company. Work

was provided for the unemployed in road construction. Many received direct monetary aid.

So numerous had been the sins of omission that the superior strength of English competition was now irresistible, and it was equally impossible to expect the workers to help themselves and to expect the capitalists to display perspicacity. Despite all that could be done, the situation of the weavers remained almost as wretched as ever. Thus was the door opened for the onslaughts of the radicals, and the king commanded that strict supervision should be exercised over the Silesian journals, "wherein we can plainly discern attempts to stir up the lower classes against the higher, the poor against the well-to-do." [1] In Breslau there was published a semi-communist newspaper, the *Volksspiegel*; under the pseudonym of Treumund Welp, the notorious man of letters Pelz published incendiary writings; whilst the Düsseldorf painter Carl Hübner, a native of East Prussia, exhibited in Berlin a picture entitled "The Silesian Weavers," which was followed by similar pitilessly truthful canvases depicting evictions, poaching affrays, and the like. Heine seized the opportunity of displaying once more his enmity to the monarch, who during these tragical confusions had shown himself to be far more tender-hearted than were the officials in his service. Here are some of the words of Heine's *Weaver's Song:*

> Curse, then, the king, the rich man's king!
> Unmoved he sees our suffering;
> Our last coins go to Berlin town;
> Like wretched dogs he shoots us down!
> We are weaving, we are weaving!

A few months later, in the spring of 1845, a secret society was discovered in the Hirschberg valley. Its members were sworn to work for the overthrow of state and society. Chief of this body was a cabinet-maker named Wurm of Warmbrunn. He did not belong to any foreign secret association, but he was familiar with the writings of the communists of other lands, and in the spirit of these writings he had drafted a proclamation summoning the highlanders to rise "against the oppressors of the working classes—against that contemptible order of human being who are known by the name of nobles, whose origin dates from the darkest days of barbarism, whose

[1] King Frederick William to Thile, undated.

ancestors so skilfully played the parts of highwaymen and incendiaries. . . . When the statues of the kings are dashed to pieces, your names will be mingled with the raging of the elements, and like a clap of thunder will terrify the last of the tyrants, will frighten him out of the camp where he sits in the midst of those who are constrained to fight for him, so that he will tremble before awakened humanity and will flee like a boy." The king promptly sent Privy Councillor Mathis as special commissioner, and among Mathis' following was the astute young referendary Stieber, who here for the first time displayed his detective talents. Among those suspected of complicity, apart from Wander the schoolmaster, an indefatigable demagogue,[1] the most notable was a manufacturer of Eichberg, Schlöffel by name, a ferocious radical who had intimate associations with the Swiss refugees. The lord lieutenant found it impossible to believe that a respectable factory owner could have been guilty of such folly. He treated Schlöffel with consideration, and kept him only a short time under arrest. There ensued a violent quarrel between Merckel and Mathis, so that the king, who was already out of humour owing to the dilatory handling of the weavers' troubles, now decided upon the dismissal of the lord lieutenant. Merckel, being an elderly man, had at an earlier date besought the king to inform him when, owing to failure of physical or moral energy, he should have ceased to inspire confidence. The minister for home affairs had now to write bluntly: "The time has arrived; his majesty is convinced that the lord lieutenant's duties have not been efficiently discharged."[2] Thus took place the retirement of the man who throughout Silesia had for more than a generation been regarded as the natural chief of the province, and who had inspired universal confidence, above all during his second term of office. Now, comprehensibly enough, he was regarded as a victim of the reaction. In a touching farewell address he expressed his gratitude for the countless proofs of affection which had been lavished on him by his Silesian "compatriots." The result of the enquiry seemed to justify Merckel's attitude. Schlöffel was acquitted, for nothing definite could be proved against him,

[1] See Vol. VI, p. 589.

[2] Cabinet Order to Privy Councillor Mathis, March 18; Schlöffel to Merckel, March 18; Reply, March 19. Reports to the king: from Count Arnim, March 24; from Mathis, April 9. Thile, Instruction to Count Arnim, April 26, 1845.

but a death sentence was passed upon Wurm, and he was sent to the penitentiary.

At this juncture Germany was passing through one of those periods of extremely high prices which have almost invariably been the precursors of revolution. The harvests of the years 1846 and 1847 had failed so completely, that the customs union, whose grain trade nearly always displayed a great preponderance of exports, was compelled in the former year to import nearly 4,350,000 bushels of rye in excess of exports, whilst in the latter year the surplus import of rye amounted to 7,500,000 bushels. In Central Germany the yield of the rye harvest was no more than three-fourths of the average. How terribly unnatural, too, were the conditions prevailing in various parts of the country! The half-famished East Prussians, having no money to pay for the grain grown in their own territory, had to export the greater part of their scanty harvest. In face of the universal wretchedness the Bundestag was just as futile as it had been thirty years earlier; and now, as formerly, Austria, a friendly member of the Federation, hastened to forbid the export of grain to the neighbouring territories of Germany.

Even the associates of the customs union were not prompt enough in agreeing upon common measures, and it was all too plain that the national commercial league was no longer guided by the careful hands of the late king, Motz, and Eichhorn. Each federal state fought for itself, the shrewdest being the kingdom of Saxony, which did not retaliate upon the Austrian prohibition of export, but got along tolerably well with moderate purchases of grain and a lax supervision of the baking industry. This was the only part of Germany in which no disturbances occurred. Elsewhere, in almost all the great towns, and even in the tranquil Stettin, hungry mobs had to be forcibly dispersed. Ominous were the disorders in Berlin during three successive days of the month of April, 1847. Matters grew worse owing to the slackness of old Governor Müffling, until order was ultimately restored by the resolute action of General Prittwitz and his cuirassiers. It was, however, a remarkable fact that a number of well-dressed men were seen among the starving mob. Numerous persons were wounded, but not one of these presented himself for treatment at the public hospitals. It was impossible to avoid the suspicion that a group of revolutionary conspirators had seized an opportunity for testing the strength of the

state authority. Alarmed by the disorders, the king, desirous of preserving the most indispensable articles of food for the use of the poor, had the distilleries closed and forbade for a time the export of potatoes—a prohibition which did absolutely no good, for, as Kühne had predicted, it served merely to increase the general distress. Du Thil, the Hessian minister, had grain purchased in Holland, intending to pay for it with bills drawn upon the house of Rothschild. But the majority of the Dutch salesmen preferred cash payment in Mainz. The philanthropic Rothschild, desiring to secure an extraordinary profit out of the extraordinary distress, demanded compensation for the unused bills of exchange—a demand flatly refused by du Thil as "a piece of impertinence." [1] Thus each ruler helped himself through the difficulties as best he could, but much discontent continued to prevail among the common people.

Actual famine raged only in one part of Germany, the sufferers being the Poles of Upper Silesia. These hopelessly impoverished miners had suffered three years in succession through the failure of the potato crop; long ere this they had been compelled to slaughter their goats, "the mountaineers' cows"; they were debilitated by alcoholism. Their condition was already appalling when typhus was introduced from Galicia. Death the reaper garnered his terrible harvest, whilst the ignorant and neglected people shut themselves up in dumb despair in their cottages. The whole life of the countryside was paralysed, and not a single pastor reported the prevailing misery to Diepenbrock, the prince-bishop. When the terrible tidings at length reached Breslau, help was forthcoming, but it arrived too late. The brethren and sisters of charity visited the villages, and voluntary contributions amounting to 360,000 thalers were sent, far more than had been provided on behalf of the Silesian weavers. But in the circles of Pless, Rybnik, and Ratibor, the state and the communes had during the next few years to care for four thousand orphans. In Pless alone, during the year 1847, there were 6,800 deaths, nearly three times the usual number, 900 at least of these deaths being due to starvation. In Germany, too, the new age and King Steam made their entry over corpses. If the political dissatisfaction of the cultured classes and the social discontent of the poor were but to join forces, the old order would inevitably be swept away.

[1] Du Thil's Sketches.

CHAPTER VII.

POLAND AND SCHLESWIG-HOLSTEIN.

§ 1. THE EUROPEAN SITUATION AFTER THE STRAITS CONVENTION.

After the peace of the world had been superficially reestablished by the straits convention (a measure which simultaneously loosened the bonds of all the old alliances), diplomatic activities seemed almost petrified for several years. England in the colonies, and Russia in Central Asia, pursued uninterruptedly the old policy of aggression, but in Europe all the powers walked warily, and endeavoured to maintain peace. Some were restrained by the omens of the approaching revolution, others by dread of the armed struggles that seemed likely to follow the death of the bourgeois king, now well on in years. How incalculable was the future of this usurped crown was made plain to an alarmed world in July, 1842, when the duke of Orleans lost his life in a carriage accident. The French honestly mourned the crown prince. In his will he exhorted his heir to remain always a Catholic, a loyal son of France and the revolution, even though he should never ascend the throne. Ferdinand Philippe had himself invariably been a straightforward representative of the modern French militarist-liberal spirit. His death involved the abandonment of many hopes and ambitions. Alfred de Musset sang:

> Mais je crois qu'une place est vide dans l'histoire.
> Tout un siècle était là, tout un siècle de gloire.

After fierce struggles in the chamber it was agreed that in the event of the accession of the count of Paris, who at the time of his father's death was not yet four years old, the eldest of his uncles, the duke of Nemours, should become regent. Louis Charles Philippe was the favourite son of the bourgeois monarch, and no one could possibly ascribe to him, as to his deceased brother Ferdinand Philippe, bold and warlike

designs. Of serious disposition, stiff manners, and conservative inclinations, he was little loved by the French people, and it was vain to expect that such a regent would be able to hold the national passions in leash.

The gloomier the prospects of the July monarchy, the more sedulously did the great powers avoid anything which could endanger the integrity of this fragile dynasty. Hence, when King Frederick William opposed the illegal scheme to found a Belgo-French customs union, and ultimately prevented its formation, the allied courts gave him no support beyond empty words. No less isolated was the king of Prussia when he requested the powers to enforce the understanding arrived at twelve years earlier, in accordance with which the fortresses on the southern frontier of Belgium, which the petty kingdom could not possibly defend, were to be dismantled.[1] For years the Parisian press had continued to declare that the "infamous fortress treaty" was null and void. The French considered that in case of war they would have a perfect right to demand that the fortresses of neutral Belgium should be immediately handed over to them without resistance. So pacifist now had the world become, that when Prussia reminded the other members of the quadruple alliance of this long-standing obligation, incontestably imposed on them by treaty, Aberdeen, Metternich, and Nesselrode were reluctant to take action, being unwilling to offend the court of the Tuileries for Prussia's sake.[2] King Leopold implored the powers (March 31, 1845) not to choose this moment for reminding him of the treaties, nor to involve him in difficulties with his French neighbours and with the political parties in his own land. "Hitherto," he wrote in conclusion, "the powers have been good enough to leave it to me to decide when the auspicious moment will come for carrying out this measure, and I strongly hope that they will continue to leave the matter in my hands."[3] The powers granted his request, and the astute Coburger was well able to arrange that the auspicious moment for the fulfilment of the treaties should never arrive.

In epochs of such a character, when the more formidable political conflicts are in abeyance, and when no fertilising

[1] See vol. V, p. 95.

[2] Liebermann's Report, March 27, 1844; Bunsen's Reports, March 18 and 31, 1845; Brunnow to Nesselrode, April 8, 1845.

[3] King Leopold of Belgium to van de Weyer in London, March 31, 1845.

new idea is compelling a definite grouping of parties, petty diplomatic intrigues are apt to flourish. Despite the popular legend of the league of the free powers of the west, and despite the friendly relationships between the two royal courts, the promised cordial understanding between England and France was never fully reestablished. On both sides of the Channel recent struggles had left a legacy of ill feeling, and the natural jealousies of the two powers came to the surface. This was plain when England demanded the right of search in the case of ships suspected of being engaged in the slave trade; it was manifest once more when the missionaries of the respective nations were at feud upon the South Sea islands; it was shown yet again when France, being engaged in a dispute with her bad neighbour of Morocco, and fearing lest England should take a hand in the game, had hastened to make peace upon easy terms. All these petty quarrels were monstrously magnified by the partisan passion of the French, and the Parisian journals insisted that the ministry for foreign affairs never dared to allow the country to show its teeth to foreigners. It was perfectly true that Guizot was wont to treat with contumely all manifestations of national sensibility, whether justified or unjustified; he seemed to regard questions of foreign policy with unemotional aloofness. England, too, had been in an uneasy and irritable mood since Palmerston had been reappointed foreign secretary (1846). Palmerston could never forget his bickerings with Talleyrand. He scented Parisian intrigues in every part of the world, regarding as a menace even the slow growth of French sea power. How fierce was the language of Bunsen when France, a Mediterranean power, built some new warships at Toulon! "It would," he opined, "be a good thing for Europe if England were to humble Bourbon pretensions in the Mediterranean." This German-Englishman saw nothing amiss in British control of the Mediterranean.[1]

The league of the western powers had become unstable, and all the more zealously did Guizot woo the favour of the Viennese court. Fervently, and at times with little dignity, he assured the Hofburg of the strictness of his conservative principles. It was his wish, he vowed, that France should make common cause with all the powers in the fight against anarchy, to repress revolution in Italy, and to reconsolidate

[1] Bunsen's Report, February 18, 1847.

monarchy in Spain. He earnestly begged that Vienna should not misunderstand the meaning of the entente cordiale of the western powers, should not foster a hostile attitude on the part of the "pure" monarchies vis-à-vis the constitutionalist monarchies. These fervent assurances aroused an unholy joy in the mind of Metternich, so that he mockingly remarked to his intimates: "It seems that these western powers regard themselves as impure monarchies!"[1] None the less he was attracted to the learned French doctrinaire by a secret elective affinity, for in course of time the July monarchy was coming to resemble more and more closely the Austrian governmental system. With Metternichian impeccability Guizot spoke of his policy of resistance as "une politique un peu grande seulement"; whilst with an obstinacy closely resembling that of the Austrian chancellor the French statesman insisted upon his "pensées immuables." Alike at the Tuileries and at the Hofburg the motto was, "Maintain the existing system." Ere long it was universally realised in the diplomatic world that Metternich, who at one time had detested the bourgeois monarchy, was now endeavouring to safeguard that monarchy as one of the pillars of European order.

Whilst Austria and France were thus drawing closer together, Czar Nicholas was endeavouring to cement the new friendship with England. He was indeed determined to defend the so-called legitimist right in Austria as elsewhere, and although he might obviously have turned to account the nationalist dissensions of the Austrian empire, might have exploited them for panslavist ends, he never attempted to do anything of the kind. In 1837, when Metternich confidentially informed him that a Hungarian revolution was possible, Nicholas' instructions to his chancellor ran as follows: "Thank Count Ficquelmont for this important communication. I pray to God that Austria may be spared the ordeal which seems imminent. I hope that effective measures have been taken, but *whatever happens*, Austria can count upon Russia"[2] —a pledge which the czar fulfilled in knightly fashion twelve years later. But he had never had absolute confidence in Metternich, believing, erroneously no doubt, that the Austrian

[1] Guizot to Flahault, April, 1844; Canitz' Report, April 20, 1844.

[2] Brunnow, Aperçu général de nos relations avec les puissances de l'Europe I have not seen this Aperçu, but Hehn gives a few quotations from the document in his Memorial, A Glimpse into the Foreign Policy of Czar Nicholas, St. Petersburg, March, 1857.

had been privy to the decabrist rising and to the Polish revolution. Of late, too, the czar had had a personal grievance. Wishing to arrange a marriage between his daughter Olga and the archduke Stephen, he had in 1844 sent Orloff to the Danube. The Austrian court, however, displaying more pride than the Protestant princes of Germany, insisted that the grand duchess must become a Roman Catholic. This stipulation put an end to the scheme, and, since the secret leaked out, there was a good deal of spiteful gossip.[1] Nicholas continued to cherish his old hostility towards France. He had scant confidence in his Prussian brother-in-law, were it only on account of the plans for a national assembly. Moreover, Prussia had long since forfeited the high prestige which had been secured for the country during the closing years of the late king's reign. Not one of the great powers was seriously concerned to maintain a close friendship with the new monarch, a man of incalculable impulses.

The czar was still cogitating his eastern plans and in order to carry these plans into effect he turned to England as an eminently desirable collaborator. Could he but win over this one power, the two eastern neighbours would inevitably follow, and France would once more be isolated. Again, as in the days of Navarino, Nicholas wished to induce the British government to assist him in his eastern policy. The diplomatic mission was entrusted to Brunnow. The czar considered it quite feasible that an understanding could be arrived at concerning the future of the Osmanli realm. Soon after the signing of the straits convention, he had astounded the Hofburg by the suggestion that it might be well to give the English court a proof of perfect confidence by disclosing to the London cabinet the secret Münchengrätz treaty, which made it incumbent on the two empires to undertake common measures should the Turkish realm be destroyed.[2] Metternich had refused; he feared lest such an unexpected act of uprightness might not enhance Britain's mistrust; moreover, he himself had acceded to the treaty merely in order to keep watch over Russia's eastern policy. Nicholas ultimately determined to see what the charm of his person could accomplish. In May, 1844, it was current talk in St. Petersburg

[1] Liebermann's Reports concerning Orloff's mission, February 6, 1844, and subsequent dates.

[2] See vol. V, p. 402.

that the czar intended to go upon a long voyage. Ere anyone could conjecture what the aim of such a journey could be, the czar appeared in person among his royal relatives at Potsdam, taking them unawares as was his wont. The next morning he continued his progress in order to visit Queen Victoria.

The unexpected guest was given a most flattering reception in England. He was even permitted, despite court etiquette, to appear in uniform, for when he donned civilian clothes he felt ill at ease, almost as if he had been flayed. He arrived at the moment when the society dames, in pursuance of their annual custom, were about to give a great Polish ball, to which the most distinguished among the refugees were invited. The anxious question naturally arose whether it would be permissible to undertake such an act of hostility under the very eyes of the czar. Brunnow, however, sent an amiable note to the duchess of Somerset, the lady patroness, writing: "I am commissioned by his majesty to ask you to be good enough to accept any sum that may be necessary to make up what is requisite for your benevolent purpose."[1] The political aim of the festivity was thus frustrated, in the politest fashion in the world, and to the intense indignation of the Polish refugees. Nicholas showered chivalrous attentions upon the young queen, and showed fatherly kindness towards her children. He expressed warm enthusiasm for the charms of Windsor and of English country life. He invariably adopted a tone of bluff, good-fellowship, saying as it were, "I know quite well that people look upon me as an actor, but it is only because I always say exactly what I think." He gave Lord Aberdeen the following friendly assurance: "I have never regarded the league of the western powers with suspicion. On the contrary, I have never ceased to esteem it a guarantee for world peace."

How could he hope that such arts would deceive the sober-minded and calculating English? What were they likely to think when he declared: "You believe Turkey to be mortally ill; in my opinion, Turkey is already dead; let us therefore come to an understanding as to the disposal of the corpse. I desire no conquests; the ownership of Constantinople might readily endanger the unity of Russia and the future of the Russian nation. But I can never

[1] Brunnow to the duchess of Somerset, July 5, 1844.

tolerate the existence of such a Byzantine empire as King Otho and the Greeks would like to establish. Were I to permit this plan to be carried out, I should reduce myself to a nullity in face of my people and my church. But I am perfectly ready for a settlement of some other kind, and I trust that England will in this matter sustain me against France." The outspoken Peel and the good-natured but dull-witted Aberdeen, honestly believed that the czar was speaking the truth; yet both these statesmen, like Prince Albert and Wellington, realised the true meaning of his words. They perceived that in no circumstances would Russia be inclined to tolerate an independent power upon the Balkan peninsula, and since England had tacitly determined that directly or indirectly the land of the Golden Horn was to become her own property, matters rested where they had begun, at the stage of a courtly interchange of ideas.[1] During these years, Helmuth von Moltke wrote: "The partition of Turkey will resemble the partition of a diamond ring, the only important question being who is to secure the diamond of Stamboul? Similar were the views of British statesmen. They absolutely refused to give any pledge for the future, as the czar would have foreseen had he been better acquainted with British policy. His journey failed to secure the desired end, and the Russian circular despatch subsequently issued, in which references were made to the successful upshot of the undertaking, was designed merely to spread a veil of anbiguous words over the defeat that had been sustained.

The rift between the two courts was manifest in other matters besides the eastern question. It is true that Nicholas used less trenchant language than of old concerning legitimist right, for both Don Carlos and Henry V were uncongenial to him owing to their personal insignificance and their clericalist sentiments. But despite a plain hint from Queen Victoria he could not make up his mind to engage in regular diplomatic intercourse with her Belgian uncle, for King Leopold had recently annoyed him greatly by admitting Polish officers into the Belgian army. After the czar's return home, Nesselrode proudly assured the foreign envoys that the entente cordiale would in future remain an empty phrase.[2] In actual fact

[1] Thile's Reports, London, June 7 and 10; Bunsen's Report, September 2, 1844.

[2] Liebermann's Report, October 26, 1844.

the friendship between the western powers, which had long been unstable, was affected neither for good nor for evil by the Russian ruler's journey. Louis Philippe, however, scented mischief, and after his plebeian manner he, too, hastened to pay his respects to "his Victoria." In the interim the prince of Prussia had made an unpretentious and non-political friendly visit to the English court. The bourgeois king's trip followed in October. Great honour was paid him; he was made a knight of the garter; the lord mayor and the aldermen of London delighted in his frank address and his vigorous hand-shaking. The proud nobles, however, found him less pleasing than the czar, whose journey had evoked their admiration were it only for its martial boldness. Parliamentarians remained cold when the loquacious Orleans ruler plumed himself on the number of ministers he had raised to power and subsequently cast down. Robert Peel declared: "He is a shrewd and clever king; his system may suit France well enough, but it would never do for England."[1]

Womanly fashion, Queen Victoria was greatly pleased by the attention of all these visits, imagining that she owed the good wishes of so many friends to her beloved husband and to the renown of her happy marriage. Yet the unending diplomatic struggle in the east, the old arena of international intrigue, served to show how little significance for politics had these courtesies between dynasts. Bitterly had unhappy Greece to suffer through the eternal disputes among the three powers, the founders of the young kingdom, who termed themselves as if in derision "les puissances créatrices." To the czar, the independence of the rebel state and of its Catholic ruling house was apriori repulsive. Wishing to win King Otho to the Orthodox church, he had despatched an imperial adjutant-general to the Greek court. Elsewhere in the east this means of persuasion had proved infallible, but here it availed him nothing, and ever since the crown prince of Bavaria had spurned the hand of his daughter Olga,[2] he had cherished a strong animus against all the Wittelsbachs.

The Russian diplomatists, widely experienced, were none the less well aware that upon the Balkan peninsula a great national state, if at all possible, could be the work of no other nationality than the Hellenic. What marvellous vitality

[1] Bunsen's Report, October 16, 1844.
[2] See vol. VI, pp. 49 and 50.

did the Greek stock continue to display, despite the extensive admixture of the blood of other races, and despite the political futility of this indestructible Hellenism, which had of old actually been successful in maintaining Greek culture on the shores of the eastern Mediterranean in defiance of the world dominion of Rome. Most of the wealthier merchants in the harbours of the Osmanli empire were Greeks. They worked, made ventures, and saved, whilst the Turks passed their days in sloth. They entered into a huge tacit conspiracy with their fellow-countrymen in the little fatherland, which unceasingly aspired towards expansion of its intolerably narrow frontiers. Even the most prepotent nationality of the west, the Italian, could not withstand Greek influence, and by degrees all the old Venetian families upon the Ionian islands and in the Cyclades had been Byzantinised. Since the czar looked upon himself as the rightful heir to the double eagle of Byzantium, he was forced to adopt a cunning policy which could not fail, once its bearing had been understood, to arouse the invincible enmity of the Hellenes. On the one hand, in order to weaken Turkey, he secretly stimulated the impotent land hunger of the Greeks, whilst endeavouring on the other hand to undermine the power of the young kingdom. This double game was played with sinister skill by Katakazi, the Russian envoy, a Greek by birth, who enjoyed the peculiar favour of Nesselrode.[1] Katakazi maintained secret communications with the Orthodox party of the Nappists, who were turning covetous eyes towards Thessaly. His reports were full of contemptuous references to King Otho, to the monarch's entourage, and to the entire state system of the Greeks.[2]

England was equally antagonistic, though on very different grounds. All parties in the island realm, and preeminently the whigs, had now regained faith in the inviolability of the Osmanli empire; philhellenist dreams had vanished; the youthful kingdom of Greece, which England had herself helped to create, was regarded with intense hatred as a thorn in the flesh of holy Turkey. Palmerston now despatched to Athens a worthy representative of this incarnate national enmity, Sir Edmund Lyons. This bluff seaman's manners towards the court exceeded in rudeness even what people were accustomed to expect from the courteous English. He absented himself

[1] Liebermann's Report, November 21, 1843.
[2] Katakazi's Reports, April 26 and May 27, 1842, and subsequent dates.

on the occasion of the king's birthday festival;[1] he stubbornly insisted on the punctual payment of interest upon the loan which the three powers had placed with Rothschild, although he knew that the financial straits of Greece made payment impossible; and before long it was an open secret that he was privately supporting the Hellenic constitutionalists. Palmerston had long been openly declaring that it was England's mission to foster aspirations towards constitutional government wherever they might arise, and above all in absolutist southern Europe. With his wonted self-complacency, he explained that the result of this policy would be "to make the nationalist party become everywhere, and spontaneously, the English party.[2] For five years, whilst the tories remained in power, Lyons continued to play this unseemly part of secret leader of a Greek faction. Aberdeen refused to recall the dangerous intriguer, for it suited the foreign secretary's plans that Greece should be weakened by internal dissensions. Piscatori, the French envoy, was likewise actively concerned in the machinations of the constitutionalists, were it only because he could not leave Lyons in unchallenged possession of the field. None the less France, alone among the three powers, continued to display a certain consideration for this unfortunate protégé, endeavouring in especial, to alleviate the financial distresses of Greece.

King Otho was without resource amid this medley of domestic and foreign intrigues. So utterly did he lack the capacities of a sovereign that in earlier years Armansperg and the English party had seriously thought of securing a medical opinion declaring him incompetent to rule. He had no personal adherents. Except for a few confidants and servants, the Bavarians of his train had long ere this returned to their native land, but the Hellenes continued to rail at "the Bavarese." His consort, Amelia of Oldenburg, a beautiful, brilliant, and ambitious woman, had formed a high estimate of her royal dignity, and had consequently become unpopular with her democratically minded subjects. The situation of this state, at one time bepraised by all Europe, but now no less universally despised, seemed almost hopeless. It was true that Athens was flourishing; the young university was thronged, almost to excess, by the sons of a race eager for

[1] Liebermann's Report, July 18, 1842.
[2] Bunsen's Report, April 6, 1847.

knowledge; the wealthier Greek residents in foreign parts vied one with another in equipping the renascent capital with magnificent buildings. But the more rapidly a new centre of Hellenic culture was formed here, the more perversely was manifested the longing for a different metropolis. The Byzantine realm towards which the Hellenes aspired could find its capital only upon the Bosphorus, and all the Greek residents in the great city of Constantine looked down with contempt upon the petty town of Athens. The warlike spirit was completely extinct. The rich merchants who spent millions upon academies and libraries, had not a drachma to spare for the strengthening of the contemptible Greek army. Without funds and without weapons, the king could do nothing to gratify the national ambition, greatly as he might long to do so.

Nor did Otho find any firm basis of support in the conceited scribbler Prokesch von Osten, whose chief, Metternich, would not hear a word in favour of the detested Greece, child of the revolution. "I deem myself fortunate," said the Austrian chancellor, "in that I had nothing to do with the creation of this political abortion." [1] The king had but one trustworthy diplomatic adviser, the Prussian envoy Brassier de Saint-Simon, an easy-going but highly cultured man of the world who had at one time charmed the court of Berlin by the brilliancy of his conversation, and who was known to wider circles as author of the barcarole "the vessel cleaves the waters." As a side issue he had a fondness for somnambulistic wonders. During this epoch of political dilettantism, nearly all the Prussian diplomats, Bunsen, Heinrich von Arnim, etc., took up homœopathy, animal magnetism, or some similar unprofitable art. The late king of Prussia had invariably supported the Hellenic policy of the Wittelsbachs, and had forbidden his nephew Adalbert to accept the offered crown of Greece, being unwilling to disturb the circles of his Bavarian kinsmen. Frederick William IV was still mindful of the philhellenist dreams of his youth. He was delighted that the Prussian envoy should give all possible aid to his beloved nephew Otho.[2] Great was his pleasure when King Louis again and again expressed gratitude, writing: "In

[1] Canitz' Report, October 18, 1843.
[2] King Frederick William, Marginal Note for Thile, December 6, 1845.

these difficult days, Prussia alone shows herself the true friend of Bavaria."[1]

It is true that Prussia, being unable to send a single warship to the Piræus, counted for little among the Greeks. Brassier's intimate relationships with the court served only to earn for the envoy the hatred of the leaders of faction. Moreover, it must unfortunately be admitted that the counsels which emanated from Potsdam were not distinguished by their wisdom. In the existing posture of affairs, King Otho, who ruled only by the people's will, could not continue to withhold from the Hellenes the greatly desired constitution; and should he voluntarily grant it at an early date, he would be more likely to maintain at least a semblance of royal authority. But his father in Munich and his uncle at Sans-Souci both implored him not to yield a jot to the importunities of the constitutionalists.

Precious time was thus wasted, whilst the envoys of the three protecting powers intrigued to their hearts' content and fanned the flames of disaffection. At length, on September 15, 1843, a mutiny broke out among the troops. Colonel Kalergis, a declared adherent of the Russian party, led his men to the palace, and extorted from the terrified king the promise of a constitution. The pledge was immediately announced from the veranda, amid thunderous acclamations, and in the presence of the foreign envoys. In advance, officials and army swore fealty to the constitution (syntagma), and a constituent assembly was then summoned to bring it into existence. Unquestionably Katakazi was behind the conspiracy, whilst Lyons and Piscatori subsequently became privy to it; and it is no less certain that the mutineers had desired to dethrone the Catholic king, the intention having been frustrated solely by Otho's unexpectedly rapid compliance with their demands. Since the real aim of the revolt had not been achieved, and since it was impossible for the czar to disclose himself before the world as patron of a constitution, Katakazi was recalled amid noisy manifestations of imperial disfavour, though the envoy was left quite unmolested after his return. The court of St. Petersburg now desired to convey the impression that Russia would have nothing more to do with these depraved Greeks. She was henceforward represented in Athens by a resident only. Nesselrode declared with a

[1] Küster's Reports, Munich, January 21 and March 30, 1844.

sardonic smile that the Greek constitution was abominable, but that that of Norway was even worse.[1] Meanwhile the unhappy land was afflicted by all the plagues of parliamentary corruption. The natural eloquence of the Hellenes found expression in interminable wordy battles. A force of palikars had to mount guard at the meeting-place of the national assembly, to maintain order among the vociferating lobbyists and place-hunters, who mobbed the representatives of the people.

As was to be expected, the working of the new syntagma was in perfect accordance with the spirit of raw radicalism and with that of doctrinaire Parisian routinism. The Russian origin of this sordid revolution was conspicuously displayed in the unanimous adoption of an article which demanded of all future kings the profession of the Greek Orthodox faith. It was true enough that in the native lands of cæsaropapism none other than an Orthodox king could possibly be regarded as a genuinely national prince. Nevertheless the right of succession had already been granted to the house of Wittelsbach without any proviso as to religion, the arrangement having been sanctioned by the treaties of the protective powers and by the assent of the Hellenes. How could such treaties now be altered by the action of one of the signatories? King Otho's marriage was childless; the greatly desired "Konstantinos" remained in the land of the unborn. Prince Luitpold, next in the succession, declared that as a true Catholic he would not abandon his religion nor permit any of his sons to change their creed.[2] King Louis, in great concern, sent Prince Wallerstein to London and to Paris, seeking any possible guarantee for the Wittelsbach succession and for the monarchical authority of the Greek crown. Neither of the two western powers would commit itself to anything beyond vague assurances, and though it had been originally intended that Wallerstein should end his diplomatic journey with a visit to Athens, this part of the scheme was dropped, for the envoy realised that the coming of a Bavarian emissary could serve only to inflame the wrath of the Hellenes.[3] Meanwhile the three protective powers had held a conference, and at this conference Brunnow innocently remarked that the belated decision as to the need for the profession of the Orthodox faith by the kings of the

[1] Liebermann's Report, April 16, 1844.
[2] Küster's Report, Munich, March 30, 1844.
[3] Liebermann's Reports, December 26, 1843, January 23 and July 13, 1844.

Hellenes would not, after all, impair the Wittelsbach right of succession. He was quite unable to understand how anyone could contest the Greek national assembly's right to come to such decisions. With equal simplicity Nesselrode wrote to Munich: "Has it not been the aim of all our proceedings to safeguard the throne of Greece for the offspring of the king of Bavaria? Would not this idea receive an additional guarantee if it were to be decided that the future sovereign must be united with his people in the bonds of a common faith? It certainly does not become the emperor of Russia to contest the necessity of a demand upon which all the Greeks are united." [1]

The conference could find no way out of the difficulty. Ultimately the king of Prussia, who desired to prevent any infringement of the rights of the Bavarian ruling house, advised that the protective powers should for the nonce postpone a formal decision upon the religious question.[2] This suggestion was adopted. The protective powers contented themselves with the utterance of certain pious wishes anent the reestablishment of order in Hellas. But they were all the more emphatic in the expression of their hope that their protégé would fulfil its monetary obligations and would renounce any idea of securing expansions of territory. The three amiable progenitors were unanimously agreed that the nullity of their offspring must persist. Aberdeen wrote unctuously to his Russian friend: "The only matter of importance is to prevent any attack on Turkey by the Greeks. For this reason, my dear Brunnow, let us both hold aloof from the struggles of faction in Greece, and let us remain true to one another." [3] England and Russia now made such urgent demands for the liquidation of the debts that the Greek minister for finance was compelled to inform the national assembly of his complete inability to present a budget, while King Otho was ultimately constrained to reduce his army to five thousand men. This, said Aberdeen, was all that the Hellenes required, for the force was sufficient to maintain order at home. Palmerston spoke yet more plainly when he subsequently said: "We desire once for all to crush this nation's Byzantine ambitions!" [4]

[1] Bunsen's Report, February 23; Nesselrode, Instruction to Viollier in Munich, February 22 (old style), 1844.

[2] Thile's Report, London, April 18, 1844.

[3] Aberdeen to Brunnow, October 18, 1844.

[4] Bunsen's Reports, March 11, 1845, March 5, 1847.

The new constitution, containing the article providing that the successor to the throne must be of the Orthodox persuasion, remained unaltered, being thus tacitly recognised by the protective powers. Russia had taken vengeance for the affront to Olga, and had secured at least a partial victory in the game. The Wittelsbachs had not been actually discrowned, but it was obvious to all that the utmost King Otho could expect would be a life occupancy of the throne, and that his brother Luitpold would never wear the crown of the Hellenes. The Bavarian newspapers, led by the ultramontane periodicals, had good reason for their loud clamour against the hostility of the Muscovites. Nesselrode, however, demanded satisfaction for the language of the press, threatening to break off diplomatic relations. In the end the court of Munich offered apologies, and forbade the newspapers to rail at Russia.[1]

In Greece the adherents of the three protective powers continued for a long time to quarrel among themselves. Brassier de Saint-Simon was recalled, for the clock of absolutism had run down. England pushed her financial claims with the utmost venom, going so far on one occasion as to send a squadron. The Russians contemplated this rough handling with tacit but malicious satisfaction. King Frederick William, on the other hand, though unable to give any help to Greece, complained bitterly that the powers were allowing the unhappy country to be ruined by British greed.[2] Finally Kolettis, the leader of the French party, secured a complete victory. Palmerston foamed with rage when he was informed of Guizot's triumph. He overwhelmed the governments of Greece and Bavaria with gross invectives, and he endeavoured to egg on Prussia against the two Wittelsbach courts. "The kingdom of Greece," he wrote to Berlin, "was not created by the three powers for the personal profit and pleasure of a Bavarian prince, but a Bavarian prince was chosen by the three powers to be king of Greece in order that he might confer happiness and material advantage upon the Greek nation. . . ." Matters would soon reach such a pitch that King Otho, "ruling through incompetent, venial, and tyrannical ministers," would "impose upon the Greeks a system of misgovernment and oppression which will make the position of a subject of the

[1] Gise to Viollier, December 7; Instruction to Count Bray in St. Petersburg, December 7, 1843.

[2] Canitz, Instruction to Rochow, September 3, 1846.

king of Greece less endurable than that of a rayah under the rule of the sultan." [1] Canitz replied dryly: "All that we are concerned about is to maintain the independence of Greece, and therefore we are unwilling to interfere with the government of that country. Before launching such violent reproaches, we should at least hear the voice of the Greek nation." [2] In Athens, Palmerston's outbursts of wrath, and the increasing insolence of Lyons, the British envoy, served only to arouse hostility.

Kolettis maintained himself in power, and during his administration, which lasted for several years, the francophil sentiments of the Hellenes became ingrained. The Greeks had respect for the German philologists, and above all for the brilliant Otfried Müller, who found a premature grave on the hill of Colonus; but their love, like that of all orientals, was given to Parisian civilisation. Moreover, the court of the Tuileries did its utmost to strengthen these sentiments by its friendly attitude towards Greece, and to a half civilised people the allurements of French liberal phraseology were irresistible. In accordance with the Parisian example, the two chief squares in Athens were respectively named Concord Square and Constitution Square, and the favourite evening stroll was from the Homonoia to the Syntagma. But the concord was as insecurely based as the fundamental law. The calculated cruelty of the protective powers, internal dissensions, and a mercantile dread of warfare, had weakened the political stamina of the Hellenes, so that the gentle protectorate which the French envoy was henceforward able to exercise beneath the shadow of the Acropolis had little significance for Europe.

In Athens, England and Russia could maintain the semblance of friendship, for both powers were planning the ruin of their protégé. In other respects, however, the national rivalry between the two powers could no longer be hidden anywhere in the east. Nesselrode continually reiterated the pacific assurances which he had given to the British cabinet in earlier years, when he had written: "The eastern policy of the czar is guided by the same principles as those which guide that policy in Europe. Being entirely free from any design of conquest, the sole aims of his majesty's policy are

[1] Palmerston to Westmoreland, May 18, 1847.
[2] Canitz to Westmoreland, May 30, 1847.

to maintain the rights of Russia and to pay due respect to the rights legitimately acquired by other powers. Never has our sublime ruler entertained the remotest thought of disturbing in any way whatever the peace of the English possessions in India."[1] When such assurances made their way to London, Robert Peel would say gloomily: "It would be contrary to the public interest to assume that Russia will fail to keep her promises." Meanwhile, the armies of the czar were gradually conquering Caucasia, and since fortune was favourable to the Russian arms, the nation delighted in the war. The Caspian had already become a Muscovite lake; Russian steamers, freighted with Persian coal, traversed its waters; the northern conqueror, thus protected in the rear, reached out ever further into the transcaspian region. Repeated enquiries from the court of St. Petersburg as to whether it was possible to arrive at a friendly understanding concerning British and Russian spheres of influence in Asia, met with no response in London, for England's ambition in the east was no less insatiable than that of Russia.

The Russian court having acquired by treaty the right of protecting the Christian vassal states, the czar exercised that right vis-à-vis Turkey with harsh arrogance. In 1842, when the Serbs had deposed their prince Michael Obrenovitch and had raised Alexander Karageorgevitch to the throne, Nicholas wrote a holograph letter to the sultan: "I am much concerned at the manner in which the Sublime Porte departs from the ways prescribed for it in the most explicit clauses of our treaties, at the manner in which it forgets the deference due to a power which recently rendered such brilliant services to the Osmanli empire at a time when the latter was encompassed with dangers—and this to recognise the triumph of the revolution, to approve the election of a prince whom rebellious subjects have had the impudence to proclaim with arms in their hands, thus giving the most sinister encouragement to a most dangerous example!" This bombastic rigmarole was merely designed to give the Porte an express reminder of its dependent position, for the Russian court was in reality quite indifferent to the dynastic change in Serbia. The alarmed padishah had now to declare the formal deposition of the discrowned prince, and the new ruler, having solemnly abdicated, was reappointed.

[1] Nesselrode to Pozzo di Borgo, October 20, 1838.

Neither Austria nor the western powers ventured to interfere with the playing of this contemptible farce.[1]

Russian diplomacy was less fortunate on the Bosphorus itself. France, as patron of the Egyptians and the Greeks, necessarily remained suspect to the Porte. Austria and Prussia had little influence in Pera. Metternich was satisfied as long as his beloved Grand Turk was left unmolested, and he contentedly remarked: "The fall of Turkey is less imminent than people imagine."[2] But the importunate Russian protectors were soon dispossessed of the sultan's favour, their place being taken by the new British envoy Stratford Canning, the most efficient representative England has ever had in the east. Born to command, a good judge of character, firm of will, but less impetuous than his predecessor Ponsonby, he was termed by the Osmanlis the Great Elchi (ambassador), and gained complete control over the insignificant young padishah, saying frankly: "I prefer a ward to a rival; the Porte does not know what is good for it." Like many of his fellow-countrymen he had in earlier days cherished philhellenist dreams, and subsequently, disillusioned upon this matter, he had come to believe that Turkey must be rejuvenated from within, and must be induced to assimilate Christian civilisation. With the help of his friend Reshid pasha he was able to bring about certain mitigations in the barbarous Turkish laws. Torture was abolished, and the sultan went so far as to promise that conversion to Christianity should no longer be a capital offence and that Christian children should no longer be forcibly gathered into the Mohammedan fold. It is true that all this effected no change in the essential nature of the oriental theocracy, and that it did nothing to alleviate the hopeless enslavement of the rayah nations. Nevertheless, the russophobe liberal press of Europe enthusiastically trumpeted the wonderful achievements of the Anglo-Turk policy of reform. Loud were the acclamations when a diplomatic banquet was held in the Beglerbeg palace, in those sumptuous domed halls where the beauties of the padishah's harem were wont to bathe of a morning in the presence of their sublime lord, and when the Great Elchi proposed the toast: "Civilisation and progress in Turkey, the entente cordiale everywhere, and above all

[1] Czar Nicholas to Sultan Abdul-Medjid, October 19 (old style), 1842; Canitz' Report, Vienna, August 7, 1843.

[2] Canitz' Report, December 13, 1843.

between West and East." In later years, Stratford de Redcliffe came to recognise that he had wasted splendid energies upon an impossible undertaking, that it was less easy than he had thought to infuse the morals of the harem with Christian civilisation. For the time being, the English envoy at the Golden Horn exercised a sway which on rare occasions only was troubled by the advent of a Russian adjutant-general. Czar Nicholas bided his time, realising doubtless that his diplomats could effect nothing in face of Canning's outstanding influence. He said savagely: "I shall take no steps against the Bosphorus as long as England and France keep quiet; but should they venture to move, I shall certainly be the first to reach Constantinople, and having seized it I shall hold fast."[1]

Public opinion in Germany was simultaneously enlightened and perplexed by *Fragments from the East*, a brilliant book penned by the Tyrolese writer Jacob Fallmerayer. This work served to stimulate the universal russophobia even more effectively than had in earlier years Urquhart's *Portfolio*. Fallmerayer considered that the whole content of modern history was embodied in "the struggle between light and darkness, between individual liberty and ignominious russism, between humiliating priestly servility and free moral dignity." In his extensive eastern travels, and through his exhaustive study of Byzantine history, the Tyrolese writer had become convinced that religious omnipotence and human degradation are invariable associates—a view which spontaneously impresses itself on the observer's mind in the lands of Islam and cæsaropapism. He admired Constantinople as "the world metropolis where the destiny of Europe is written." Like so many of the envoys in Pera, he was mastered by a strange delirium, so that he could see nothing in the whole world beyond the eastern question.

Prussia, a land quite unknown to Fallmerayer, held the prosaic opinion that for four centuries the destiny of Europe had no longer been written on the Bosphorus. Since Prussia, therefore, cared little for the diplomatic intrigues of our traveller's world metropolis, he believed that Germany had sunk into a condition of shameful decrepitude. His opinion of the modern Greeks was equally despondent. With a great parade of historical learning he declared them to be a pitiful

[1] Rochow's Report, December 30, 1846.

"slawischschkypetarisch" [Slavo-Albanian] mongrel brood. He utterly failed to realise that nationality is not exclusively determined by purity of blood. Almost everywhere in Europe after the great national migrations the superior civilisations of the vanquished wreaked vengeance upon the barbarian victors. On Hellenic soil the Slavs had become Byzantines, just as the Goths, the Lombards, and the Burgundians had become Latins on Roman soil. The Hellenes conceived a mortal hatred for their slanderer, and to King Louis it seemed monstrous that in the Bavarian *Allgemeine Zeitung* a professor who had long been domiciled in Bavaria should thus cast discredit upon the the darlings of the Wittelsbachs. The dominant sentiments of the writer of *Fragments* were russophobia, hellenophobia, indignation at Germany's weakness and wrath aroused by the "Vibius Egnatius Tartuffius" of the priesthood. He was fond of terming himself a man of the world, on the ground that he had moved in distinguished circles in France, Russia, and Pera; and he made fun of the doctrinaire philhellenist enthusiasm of the German philologians. He was in truth quite devoid of political acumen, and was incapable of realising the effect of his own words. His unsparing abuse of the Hellenes played into the hands of the Russians whom he so cordially detested, while the mockery he levelled at Egnatius Tartuffius could not fail to please the czar, who was fighting the ultramontanes everywhere, and above all in Bavaria. None the less there was in Fallmerayer's composition a certain admixture of poetic genius, and therein lay his strength. The style of the *Fragments* is somewhat overladen, but the book sparkles with spirit and vitality. The splendid ultra-romanticist descriptions of the palace of the Comneni in Trebizond, of the forest solitudes on the shores of the Black Sea, of the laurel groves surrounding the monastery of Mount Athos, remained imperishable memories to his readers, who could greedily swallow the political gibberish of the talented writer in the sweet confection of these pictorial descriptions. Yet all that Fallmerayer had to say was in effect: "Since death is free from the sins of life, the Turk stands high above the rayah nations." Seeing that free England ruled at Pera, the German liberals gave themselves up to the agreeable hope that for the time being the city of Constantine was well cared for by the Grand Turk and his enlightened eunuchs.

§ 2. RISINGS IN POLAND. ANNEXATION OF CRACOW.

From out this aimless medley of diplomatic struggles there ultimately emerged a firmer grouping of parties, for the subterranean intrigues of the Polish conspirators compelled the three eastern powers to take common action. The hospitable support which this party of declared revolution secured in England, Belgium, Switzerland, and above all France, mocked at all international law. With astounding impudence the court of the Tuileries was wont to address the Berlin ministries with enquiries for information concerning Prussian subjects who, as Polish martyrs, were being granted maintenance in Paris from the secret fund. Canitz angrily opined: "This is indeed a strange demand which has been so often repeated, that the Prussian government should provide information and identification papers where traitors are concerned." Nevertheless the desired information was rarely refused, for in this wise the Prussian government secured trustworthy intelligence as to the individuality of these traitors.[1] Many of the so-called outlaws, persons who had never been molested, were voluntary exiles, desiring to enjoy the charms of Parisian life (irresistible to every Polish heart), or to carry on the evil work of conspiracy more safely under French protection. The three most distinguished Polish poets of the day, Mickiewicz, Krasinski, and Stowaski played no less movingly than Heinrich Heine the role of the voluntary refugee.

In such emigrant circles the extremists invariably gained the upper hand. The aristocratic section, the Society of the Third of May, continued to honour the veteran prince, Czartoryski, as King Adam I. Czartoryski, however, remained cautiously in the background. In the Lambert palace he welcomed the Polish refugees with princely hospitality, and was prepared from time to time to receive the homage of the Parisian students and journalists. Year by year, on November 29th, the festival of the great week, he delivered to his fellow-countrymen a carefully composed address, encouraging them to look forward to the universal national rising, but warning them at the same time against

[1] Canitz, Comment on the Note by the Marquis of Dalmatie, November 24; Bodelschwingh to Canitz, December 21, 1846.

revolutionary precipitancy. In Counts Zamoyski and Walewski his party possessed two efficient agents who were unwearied travellers; while in Posen, Count Titus Dzialynski, cunning and wealthy, was a powerful secret ally. The Poles were in relation with the internationalist priestly circle in Munich,[1] and also with the higher clergy of Posen, for since the easy triumphs of Archbishop Dunin the Posen clericals had hardly troubled to conceal their revolutionary sentiments. Indeed a song was current among the peasantry which ran as follows:

> Muster all against the foe!
> Lay the German tyrants low!
> I, the provost, if you do,
> Crowns in heaven promise you!

But the mass of the gentry and the parish priests were by no means inclined to follow the lead of the distinguished prelates and nobles. After desolating struggles among six factions, the Democratic Society, the organ of the Versailles Centralisation, remained supreme. This body proclaimed its "purely democratic and philosophical principles"; advocated the radical doctrines of the Young Hegelians, doctrines which approximated to those of the communists; and inscribed upon its banner, not revolt merely, but the social revolution. In the reestablished Polish realm of 1772 all social differences were to disappear, and all Poles were to be brothers, children of a single father, God, and of a single mother, their country. The old and natural elective affinity between the Polish nobles' passion for liberty and modern radicalism was once again manifest. The blue-blooded gentleman of Posen was eager to adopt democratic catchwords. In agricultural societies, charitable organisations, and reading clubs, hobnobbing in comradely fashion with the peasants who in other circumstances were wont to kiss his knees, he would affectionately declare that no longer was he to be addressed as "count" but only as "brother." Nor did the democrats refrain from turning religious fanaticism to advantage. Now that the episcopal dispute had been settled, people railed at the tolerance displayed by the king towards the German Catholics in Schneidemühl.

[1] Notice sur l'émigration polonaise, from Count Orloff's department, despatched to Berlin through Rochow's instrumentality on December 26, 1846, should be used with caution.

Quarrels here led to bloodshed, and again and again the parish priests warned their peasant flocks that the Prussians wished to rob them of their religion.

The leading spirit in the Democratic Society was Ludwik Mieroslawski, a typical representative of the internationalist demagogues of noble birth. Born in France, he was more at home in the French tongue than in the Polish. He had participated in the war against Russia. A man of considerable talent, and possessing a fair knowledge of mathematics and military arts, he was especially admired as an orator and a maker of extempore verses. Chivalrous, vain, garrulous, and amiable, like so many Poles alternately gentle and truculent, a lover of women, dancing, and the niceties of the toilet, he was so utterly frivolous that in a single breath he would voice the praises of the Virgin Mary, his Polish fatherland, and his inamorata. There existed in addition a genuinely communist party, represented in Posen by the authors who wrote for the Stefanski publishing house. In this eastern region, where mobile capital was scarce, communism could mean nothing else than distribution of land. In Posen the magic phrase could rarely exercise its inflammatory charm, for here, through the justice of a benevolent government, the affairs of the tillers of the soil had been tolerably well ordered. The friendly advances of the nobles who had of old been so arrogant were received with suspicion by the peasant, were it only because in intercourse with the Jewish hucksters he had learned to rely upon the maxim: "Whoever flatters me wants to get the better of me." Terrible, however, and altogether different from what the short-sighted demagogues had anticipated, was the effect of communist propaganda in Galicia, where the countryfolk had long been murmuring at the severity of the corvée and other exactions and were now hoping for a bloody vengeance upon the cruel lords of the soil.

The court of Vienna was profoundly disquieted by these incessant intrigues, though they almost escaped the notice of Archduke Ferdinand, the easy-going viceroy. A further source of anxiety was the perpetual coming and going of secret emissaries to and from Cracow, the last remaining sanctuary of Polish nationalism. Most alarming of all to the Austrians was the bold language used in the Posen diet. As early as the summer of 1842, Metternich confidentially enquired of the other partitioning powers whether it did not seem to them

desirable at this juncture to act upon the secret treaty of October 14, 1835, and to include at least the Cracow region within the customs lines of Austria.[1] His conduct in this matter was by no means disingenuous. Though he declared that in existing circumstances it would be "a folly" to carry the treaty fully into effect, to incorporate the republic in its entirety within the Austrian empire, Canitz, the Prussian envoy, speedily realised that this folly was precisely what Austria desired.[2] King Frederick William rejected with horror the idea of such an attack upon his beloved Poland, and since while he had been crown prince he had been vouchsafed little information regarding the secrets of diplomacy, he would not even believe that so shameful a treaty had ever been formally concluded. Liebermann, his envoy in St. Petersburg, who had been privy to the whole affair, was of course able to set the king right upon this matter, but Frederick William none the less maintained his opposition, insisted that the old agreement must be completely forgotten, and demanded a scrupulous respect for the independence of Cracow. Czar Nicholas, though he was quite at one with Metternich in the matter, was unwilling for the nonce to coerce his brother-in-law. The Viennese court, therefore, postponed for a time the carrying of the proposal into effect,[3] and Canitz delightedly reported. "The blow has been averted. The threatened existence of the poor protégé has been preserved by the utterance of one of its illustrious protectors; the partition of Poland will not be reenacted in a pettifogging fashion by the oppression of the ultimate vestiges of the country. The plan, as it deserved, has been killed and buried."[4]

All too soon were these good-natured expectations to suffer disillusionment. The Russians seized every possible chance of throwing discredit on the Poles and of referring to the conspirators' relentless designs. When Nicholas was travelling through Posen in October, 1843, a musket shot, so it was declared, was fired at one of the carriages in the imperial train. The czar honestly believed that his life had been in danger, and his court loudly deplored "l'horrible attentat de Posen." Despite the most stringent enquiries, the author

[1] See vol. VI. p. 41.
[2] Canitz' Report, December 8, 1842.
[3] Liebermann's Report, November 14, 1843.
[4] Canitz' Report, January, 1843.

of the alleged outrage was never discovered, and there can be little doubt that the whole affair was a product of Muscovite fantasy.[1] But in the following January some of the ringleaders of the great Parisian conspiracy were arrested in Posen, and now that the authorities were on the alert, the other adepts clamoured for the immediate opening of the campaign. Hoping to allay their impatience, Mieroslawski hastened to the spot from Paris in March, 1845, but he soon realised that the passions of the conspirators could no longer be held in leash, and when he revisited Posen in December, after a secret council in Cracow, he decided that the crazy but long designed enterprise should at length be set in motion. Since the kingdom of Poland was tightly gripped in the iron hand of the viceroy Paskiewitch, the rising was on this occasion to begin in Posen and Galicia, but was speedily, growing like an avalanche, to spread over the kingdom, to involve Lithuania and Little Russia, and to extend even to the Dvina and the Dnieper, for where were the limits to Mieroslawski's imagination ?

The respective roles were assigned in Cracow, the commanders of the scattered revolts being appointed, and it was arranged that the outbreaks should occur simultaneously in the middle of February, 1846. Even Czartoryski's aristocratic party could no longer venture to withstand the storm of national enthusiasm. In response to a request to his followers, King Adam declared that he desired to be nothing more than chief among the émigrés, and that he would prefer to leave to the nation itself the decision as to its future constitution. The old prince was weary, completely overcome by the spirit of renunciation, and had in truth nothing to offer his people beyond fine words.

Lord Lieutenant Beurmann, having made further arrests, had got wind of the affair. When the Posen conspirators assembled at their meeting-place on February 14th, intending to make their final arrangements over a midday banquet, they learned that all was discovered. General Steinäcker, the resolute commanding officer, had stopped all leave and had had certain non-commissioned officers arrested as suspects, while Mieroslawski had been seized in one of the lesser provincial towns and brought in fetters to Posen. In the following week a number of peasants, to whom a Carmelite monk had preached a war of religion, advanced by night to attack Preussisch-

[1] Liebermann's Reports, October 10, 14, and 23, 1843.

Stargard, but as soon as they perceived that they would have to fight the authorities, they dispersed. The fires of battle flamed up once more on March 3rd, when exciting intelligence was received from Cracow. Dr. Niegolewski, a young hothead, aided by one of Count Dzialynski's head gamekeepers, led a small body of men in a nocturnal onslaught upon Fort Winiary, the Posen citadel, but the attacking force was stopped upon the Wallischei bridge, and most of the rebels were arrested. Such was the ignominious end of a widely ramified conspiracy in which the demagogues of Paris, London, Brussels, and Leipzig had collaborated, and for which the embassies of the western powers had shamelessly acted as intelligence departments. The authorities were everywhere equal to the occasion, acting firmly but without needless severity, so that the thanks which the king subsequently expressed to Beurmann were well merited.[1] Save for a handful of lieutenants and non-commissioned officers, the fidelity of the troops was unshaken. A commission of enquiry had been set on foot in the previous January; numerous arrests ensued, and the province seemed to have been quickly tranquillised as soon as a state of siege had been declared. But new dangers quickly followed the winning of this easy and almost bloodless victory. The conspiracy had been widespread; the Democratic Society had at least three thousand members, while in the province there were also quite a number of half-initiated associate members, and since the traitors had not been given a taste of the sharpness of Prussian steel, the fire continued to smoulder beneath the ashes. In Russian Poland, likewise, there were no more than spasmodic attempts at revolt, which were speedily repressed with much cruelty.

Far more violent were the disturbances in Galicia. On February 18th, General Collin entered Cracow with one thousand Austrian soldiers, for the republican authorities had declared their inability to defend themselves. When the rising actually occurred three days later, the imperial general's nerve failed him, and he evacuated the town, though with a little courage he could doubtless have held the place easily enough. With him fled the rightful governments and the residents of the three protective powers. The pitiful republic spontaneously dissolved, and for a few days Tyssowski ruled as dictator, promptly issuing a manifesto to all Poles, announcing that the

[1] Cabinet Order to Beurmann, October 8, 1846.

hour of revolt had struck, and summoning them to swear unconditional obedience to the national government of the Polish republic. Cracow was to be the centre of the reconstituted realm of Poland. But now the Austrian troops returned, a larger body of soldiers reinforced by peasant levies, and the insurgents were speedily defeated. In these skirmishes Colonel Benedek, "the falcon of the Vistula," laid the foundations of his military renown. By March 3rd the city was once more in the hands of the Austrians; before long the other protective powers sent troops; the last refugees from among the insurgents surrendered to the Prussians; a government supervised by the three residents was made responsible for the maintenance of order. In the interim a terrible jacquerie had broken out in the adjoining regions of Galicia. Not in vain had the dreams of communist happiness been preached to the peasants. The rage of the ill-used serfs now flamed into fury, and was directed, not against the imperial authorities, with whom the peasants had little direct acquaintance, but against more immediate oppressors, the lords of the soil and their hard-fisted administrators, the mandatories. In eastern Galicia, where only the nobles were Poles, whereas the peasantry belonged to the Orthodox Red Russian [Ruthenian] stock, hatred for the nobility was intensified by religious and nationalist hostility, and a Ruthenian folk-song declared "destruction awaits the proud Pole." The mansions of the gentry were burned and pillaged, the rioters being led by a time-expired soldier named Szela.

It was a typically Sarmatian drama. Just as in the Polish diets of former days the anarchy of the *liberum veto* had been restricted by the yet worse anarchy of the armed confederations, so now the conspiracy of the nobles was thwarted by the frenzied doings of the corveable peasants. The activities of the Hofburg were paralysed by terror. Moreover, the Austrian army was not wholly to be trusted, for some of the officers were in the conspiracy. The authorities were helpless, and did nothing to restrain the bands of plunderers, whilst the prefect of the Tarnow circle actually gave the peasants a premium for every nobleman whom they brought in as prisoner. Indubitably the court of Vienna had never commanded the payment of any such blood money, were it only because the Hofburg lacked courage for the step. But it remained the disgraceful truth that the political revolution had been forced

on by tacit toleration of the social revolution. After a few terrible days, the thirst for blood had been quenched; the peasants returned home gratified with the knowledge that the red cock had crowed on many a lordly roof-tree. The old system was at the end of its resources. Metternich wrote with a sigh of relief: "The greatest and weightiest attempt of the revolutionary party, the one especially favoured by a variety of circumstances, has been frustrated."[1] Yet after all these atrocities, the chancellor had no atonement to offer to the distracted crown-land beyond the dismissal of the witless viceroy, and a wholly inadequate law providing for the voluntary emancipation of the serfs.

The rising had been suppressed, and the lovers of tranquillity breathed more freely, but all who were competent to look ahead recognised that a serious diplomatic complication was imminent. Even the old Guelph king remarked, in comment upon his Berlinese envoy's triumphant report: "I do not believe that the trouble is over. The political question has now to be considered. We have to ask, What is to be done with this republic?"[2] In actual fact the Viennese court, as soon as its first alarm had subsided, returned to its original plans. The republic of Cracow, the nursery of all political risings, must be abolished—and it was indeed obvious that the eastern powers could not contemplate the artificial reconstruction of this disastrous state. On February 25th Metternich laid his proposals before Medem, the Russian envoy, arrogantly adding: "Should Prussia object, we will ignore her (nous nous passerons de la Prusse)." The czar refused to adopt so drastic a method. Writing to his brother-in-law he said that after all that had happened the annihilation of the state of Cracow was inevitable. "It is necessary," he continued, "for us to come to a friendly understanding upon this matter, so that such criminal enterprises may be prevented once and for all." To this end he proposed to send to Berlin Count Berg, a German who had gained distinction in the Russian military service, a straightforward man well-known in Prussia.[3] At the request of Nicholas, Emperor Ferdinand likewise announced his intention to send to the Prussian capital his

[1] Metternich to Canitz, March 20, 1846.

[2] King Ernest Augustus, Marginal Note to Knyphausen's Report of March 8, 1846.

[3] Czar Nicholas to King Frederick William, March 5, 1846.

trusted negotiator, General Ficquelmont. At the same time Metternich endeavoured to influence the suggestible mind of his royal friend by a didactic letter, writing: "In my moral composition there are to be found, in addition to many other inclinations and disinclinations, a fondness for *deeds*, and a dislike for unmeaning words, or for words which, though they may appear insignificant, are in truth empty. To the last-named category belongs nationalism and its direct application to the Polish question. It seems to be considered that with reference to nationalism and to Poland it is not merely possible to put in question the entire status of all the realms of the world down to the smallest political entities, but even on doctrinaire grounds to cast them all upon the scrap heap." [1]

When the two plenipotentiaries reached Berlin in April, they found the foreign office in charge of a new minister. Bülow was suffering from an incurable affection of the brain, and General Canitz, who had been for some months past in Berlin as adviser to the king concerning the plans for a national assembly, had quite unexpectedly been appointed to the vacant post. What an irony of fate! Very recently, as envoy in Vienna, Canitz had declared that a fresh partition of Poland was inadmissible, and he was now forced to collaborate in such a partition. Just as little as the king was he willing to accept Metternich's doctrine concerning the revolutionary efficacy of "nationalism," but he was compelled to admit that the radicals had misused and falsified the conception of Polish nationality; [2] and since the reestablishment of a petty state which for a whole generation had been scandalously disregarding the obligations of neutrality was manifestly impossible, in a secret protocol of April 15th Prussia approved the proposals of the two imperial courts. The republic of Cracow, having destroyed itself, was to be incorporated into the Austrian state.

Canitz had adopted this legal ground for the proposed course because he desired to avoid any reference to the secret treaty of 1835. "In what a light," he wrote subsequently, "should we have appeared to the world had it become known that the destruction of Cracow had been decided on eleven years earlier, though in the interim the existence of any such

[1] Despatches to King Frederick William: from Emperor Ferdinand, March 29; from Metternich, March 29, 1846.

[2] Canitz, Observations confidentielles, April, 1846.

resolve had been repeatedly and solemnly denied!"[1] Article 2 of the protocol, adopted upon Canitz' proposal, ran as follows: "This incorporation will not be carried into effect until all necessary preliminaries concerning the relationships between the three high contracting parties both among themselves and with other powers shall have been arranged. These arrangements will be effected at a conference to be held in Vienna." But General Berg declared definitely and without contradiction that this article must on no account be interpreted as meaning that the formal assent of "the other powers" was requisite. Far from it, for the three powers expressly insisted upon their right to carry out their decision unconditionally.[2] The semblance of harmony was thus preserved, and the two imperial powers looked forward with satisfaction to the Viennese conference, which was to meet at the earliest possible date. Nesselrode thanked the Prussian government warmly for having avoided all "vexatious disputes." His language was so extraordinarily cordial that Canitz expressed amazement, writing: "The Russians seem positively astounded at our displaying so yielding a disposition.[3]

In any case the czar had good reason for joyful surprise. The April treaty, to which the royal patron of Polish patriotism had given no more than reluctant approval, would not merely serve to inflame liberal public opinion against the court of Berlin, but positively threatened to inflict grave losses upon the Prussian economic system. The Viennese treaties provided that the republic of Cracow was to be a free trade area, and the Breslau merchants had known how to turn this advantage to the greatest possible account. Maintaining branch offices in the republic, they sent thither, in addition to German products, large quantities of colonial goods. These, paying no more than the trifling transit dues imposed by the customs union, were carried direct from the seaports to the town on the Vistula. Of the imports, no more than a small fraction was consumed in Cracow. The balance was smuggled across the frontiers to the Austrian and Russian Poles, this trade being in the hands of the Jews, who looked upon the lawless little state as a second land of Goshen. It was a

[1] Canitz, Instruction to Rochow, January 24, 1847.

[2] Procès verbal to the Berlin protocol of April 15, 1846.

[3] Nesselrode, Instruction to Meyendorff, April 20; Canitz, Instruction to Rochow, May 3, 1846.

flourishing trade. Of 92,000 cwt. of goods in transit crossing the Silesian frontier in the year 1844, nearly 78,000 cwt. went to Cracow by way of Neu-Berun, this being about half of the total exports from Silesia. A single mercantile house in Breslau had a yearly turnover in the republic of 900,000 thalers. The customs union, having no tariff agreements either with Russia or with Austria, did not consider itself called upon to interfere with this traffic. The only profit to the union was from the transit dues, and it was seldom that any goods thus delivered in Cracow could find their way back into Germany across the well-guarded German frontier.

As soon as the domain of the republic should have been incorporated within the Austrian customs lines, the continuance of this long-established branch of commerce would become impossible. The Prussian government, therefore, could not give its definitive approval to the annexation until an unambiguous assurance should have been given that German trade would receive at least a partial compensation for the threatened losses. Moreover, it was essential that Prussia should state her conditions speedily and decisively, seeing that the menaced traffic was for the major part contraband, and that therefore, when the change had once been effected, a statement of grievances would certainly fail to evoke any redress. Canitz realised this, and promptly arranged that certain commercial experts should elaborate a memorial, the gist of which was that as a minimum Prussia must ask for three assurances. First of all there must be a bonded warehouse in Cracow, established under lenient conditions. Secondly, the transit dues in Cracow territory must be low, as heretofore. Thirdly, the Cracow-Breslau railway, which had long been under contemplation, must be built quickly, and the line must grant especially easy terms for transit traffic.[1] These extremely modest conditions were far from providing full compensation for the Silesian men of business who during the last three decades had been investing large amounts of capital in the Cracovian free trade area, and the memorial frankly declared that far more extensive demands might be posited. Was Prussia to hand over to the Austrians (who had no legal claim whatever) an important junction of commercial and

[1] Promemoria concerning the Importance of the preexistent political Conditions of the free City of Cracow vis-à-vis Silesian Trade, April 30, 1846. (Presumably issued by the foreign office.)

military routes situate within a few miles of the Prussian frontier, and in return for this concession to have the traditional channels of Silesian trade ruthlessly disturbed?

Since the annexation of Cracow could not be effected without Prussia's consent, the court of Berlin was enabled to ensure the granting of some of the demands which Silesia, thrust out like a wedge into foreign territories, had for years been formulating. These demands were: free trade in frontier districts in respect of the immediate necessaries of life; the free import of Silesian linen yarn, which was woven in Bohemia and then sent back again; above all, the reduction of some of the prohibitive dues, especially in the case of textiles. Expert knowledge was, however, requisite for the drafting of these arrangements, and once again had Prussia to pay for having transferred Eichhorn to the ministry for public worship and education—Eichhorn, the supreme diplomatist of the customs union. Not one of the leading men in the foreign office was competent to form a sound estimate of the commercial consequences of the annexation of Cracow by Austria. It was impossible to ask the Silesian merchants or the industrials chiefly concerned, seeing that the April protocol was to be kept a profound secret for the time. The upshot was that Canitz left the commercial question open, although that question could certainly have been settled with the aid of well-timed importunity.

Yet there was no lack of time to negotiate, for the Viennese court, which had at first been eager, was now hesitant, fearing the opposition of the western powers. Prussia and Russia withdrew their troops from Cracow. The three residents returned home, and the city was provisionally guarded by Austrian troops, for the three powers, terming themselves "les puissances créatrices et protectrices de Cracovie," and having just as much right to the name as had France, Russia, and England to be called the protective powers of Greece, desired to demonstrate unmistakably to the world that their protégé no longer possessed any government.[1] Nevertheless, Metternich allowed the whole summer to pass without summoning the envoys of Prussia and Russia to the agreed conference. As he sapiently remarked: "I am ever ready to recognise principles, but when it comes to action I bide my time.[2]

[1] Canitz, Instruction to Rochow, June 24, 1846.
[2] Count Arnim's Report, September 21, 1846.

In July, King Frederick William, travelling through Königswart, had a meeting there with the Austrian chancellor, this rencounter affording an opportunity for the unconditional and definite consideration of Prussia's commercial demands. But the opportunity was unutilised, for the only political matters discussed were those relating to the Prussian constitutional question. Not until later, on August 28th, did the king send Metternich one of those unfortunate though kindly meant missives whereby he had so often before involved clear diplomatic affairs in obscurity. It was his wish, he wrote, to preserve the status quo in Cracow, and therefore to maintain freedom of trade until a fresh agreement should have been secured. He desired, however, "to observe treaty obligations and not to disregard them"; he confidently left it to the Viennese court to decide when the right moment for the annexation should have arrived. Metternich replied on September 27th with non-committal assurances: "To-day the moment for negotiation has not yet come. I have not so far even summoned the envoys to consult with me, and I beg that your majesty will in any case leave matters in my hands, seeing that I am not a person likely to abuse confidence." [1]

It was a great misfortune that in Vienna at this juncture Prussia was as badly represented as in the evil days of Prince Hatzfeldt. Under a weak government, diplomacy is wont speedily to lose national pride and self-confidence, and nowhere does such a change occur more rapidly than in Germany, a land in which cosmopolitan sentiment prevails. Canitz' successor, Count Arnim, man of the world and gourmet, commonly nicknamed "Cake Arnim," had been greatly liked as envoy in Paris because his utterances were invariably moulded to suit the bourgeois king's taste. When transferred from the Seine to the Danube, he adapted himself with equal facility to the demands of Austrian policy. Every morning and every evening he presented himself at the imperial chancellery, and all that Metternich had to say was sacred to him. Arnim's instructions were that he should first of all secure the acceptance of the three points specified in the before-mentioned memorial, namely, the bonded warehouse at Cracow, free transit, and the railway. Subsequently, insisting upon detailed negotiation, he was to induce the Austrians to grant additional compensatory advantages to Prussian trade. He was told that on no account was he

[1] Metternich to King Frederick William, September 27, 1846.

to agree to the definitive annexation until the commercal question had been settled to Prussia's satisfaction. But he had absolutely no knowledge of economic matters, and took no steps whatever to enlighten himself regarding them.

Towards the end of October, Metternich, who had all this while been withstanding the urgency of the Russian envoy, suddenly declared that the right moment for the annexation had now arrived. The time was well chosen, for at this juncture the western powers were so much at odds concerning the question of the Spanish succession that a vigorous joint protest from them against the incorporation of Cracow was not to be expected. Further, a doleful report (an arranged matter, of course) had just been sent in by the Austrian commandant in Cracow, who declared that it had become simply impossible to maintain order, and that the formal annexation ought not to be further postponed. The Viennese court, having dallied hitherto, was now correspondingly eager to get on with the work, hoping to confront the western powers with an accomplished fact and simultaneously to cheat unsuspecting Prussia. What else had the history of the customs union been but a succession of Austrian reverses? Now there was a chance of taking vengeance for all the shame that had been suffered, a chance of inflicting a painful humiliation upon the Prussian rival in that commercio-political domain wherein Prussia had hitherto invariably proved victorious.

Metternich was positively rejuvenated by this cheerful expectation, and with rare resoluteness he moved forward step by step. During the early days of November he summoned Arnim and Medem to a conference. On November 6th he gave the Prussian a written assurance that Austria agreed to the three points of the memorial.[1] As to other matters, he said genially, the Russian chiming in, Austria and Prussia could come to an understanding later. Arnim allowed himself to be won over by these soft words, although he had within the last day or two received renewed instructions from Berlin forbidding him to agree to the annexation until the pledges of the April protocol had been fulfilled and the commercial question had been settled.[2] The same day the three plenipotentiaries signed a protocol wherein it was again stated that the protective powers were "under the necessity

[1] Metternich to Arnim, November 6, 1846.

[2] Canitz, Instruction to Arnim, October 31, 1846.

of refraining from calling again into life, of refraining from reestablishing, a creation which has destroyed itself after exhausting the patience of its founders." Thereupon the treaty of May 3, 1815, upon which the republic had been founded, was cancelled, and it was formally agreed that the Cracovian domain was to be reunited with the Austrian monarchy, of which it had been part prior to 1809.[1] A few days later, Emperor Ferdinand publicly announced the annexation, and in January, 1847, the Austrian customs system was introduced throughout the territory of Cracow. The Prussian government had been absolutely overreached, and was moreover liable to be justly reproached with having foolishly sacrificed national interests.

The only possible answer to so unprecedented a proceeding was the recall of the envoy who had forgotten his duty. There was no reason why the crown should be bound by Arnim's valueless signature, though it was true that Prussia had abandoned her sharpest weapon by withdrawing her troops from Cracow in the previous summer. But the king considered that it would be unchivalrous to betray to the world the dissensions in the camp of the eastern powers at the very moment when public opinion in western Europe was inflamed on account of the fresh partition of Poland. Count Arnim was sharply reprimanded, but retained his post. He urgently begged for forgiveness, and endeavoured to excuse his conduct by heedlessly retailing all the fables which the Austrians poured into his ears concerning the Cracow affair. "It is said of me," he wrote complacently, "that Metternich has me in his pocket, but the same report has been current concerning all previous Prussian envoys."[2] He was commanded to lodge a protest immediately, and to state that further claims were held in reserve. But his signature was not withdrawn, and the Viennese protocol had therefore to be regarded as legally valid. The game had been lost, and a belated statement of grievances could lead merely to additional humiliations. Canitz was an experienced diplomatist; his appointment had aroused high hopes; but it now became apparent that the king had once more failed to find the right man. The talented minister opened his new career with a shameful

[1] Protocol of the Vienna conference of November 6, 1846.

[2] Count Arnim, Report to the king, November 7, 1846; Report to Canitz, January 10, 1847.

defeat, and misfortune was to dog his footsteps inexorably during all the days of his activity as foreign minister.

In this dispute the czar was from the outset upon Austria's side. His only interest was the control of Polish nationalism, for economic concerns were nothing to him. "I am well aware," he said to Rauch, "that both Prussian and Russian subjects will be injuriously affected by the annexation, but monetary considerations are of no account in face of political necessity." In the name of friendship he made a personal appeal to the king, adjuring Frederick William not to push the dispute further, and to avoid disturbing the harmony of the eastern powers. As if in mockery he added that Prussia should have enforced her demands at an earlier stage—although at the Vienna conference his own envoy had shortly before suggested that the German powers should subsequently come to terms upon the commercial question![1] Thus flouted by both the imperial powers, Canitz had recourse to empty threats, declaring that if the frontier embargo should actually be enforced the only possible resource would be "to appeal to contemporaries and posterity by making the negotiations public." When the dreaded thing happened, his complaints resembled those of a model schoolboy who has been unjustly punished. "Despite this conduct, which is such as we should not have been guilty of even towards a mediatised prince, we have never failed to keep troth with foreigners, for we were unwilling to make a European scandal and to afford triumph to our enemies by disclosing how shamefully we have been maltreated."[2] Metternich could scarcely conceal his malicious delight. Assuming an injured mood, he wrote to the envoy in Berlin on January 7, 1847, to enquire what more Prussia could really want. Austria had agreed to the three points of the Prussian memorial, and had thus done everything that could be wished. There is no reason, he added dryly, why we should give compensation, seeing that the trading losses are an inevitable consequence of the annexation. Canitz rejoined: "It is possible to reproach us with lack of foresight. It was a mistake to withdraw the royal troops at so early a date. We ought not to have agreed to the annexation.

[1] Rauch's Report to the king, January 8, 1847; Nesselrode, Instruction to Meyendorff, December 31 (old style), 1846.

[2] Canitz to Arnim, November 24; to Rochow, December 26, 1846.

But we confided in the honour of the chancellor, who had promised our ruler not to abuse his confidence.[1]

But in diplomatic intercourse an indiscretion is not merely an error of judgment; it is a moral transgression. Metternich could not fail to regard these unworthy complaints with contemptuous scorn. In Prussia meanwhile, now that the annexation had been made public, there was a storm of indignation. The merchants of Berlin, the burghers of Breslau, even the great foundry owners of Silesia, Count Hochberg and Count Renard, implored the minister to secure at least some reductions of tariff on behalf of the disturbed Cracow trade. The ministry for commerce supported the demand, while the other governments of the customs union gave expression to their concern. Pinder, chief burgomaster of Breslau, actually hastened to Vienna to voice the interests of the burghers. A negotiator on behalf of the Prussian foreign office was also in the Austrian capital in December. This was von Kamptz, councillor to legation, nephew to the persecutor of the demagogues, a young official thoroughly well-informed regarding commercial matters, and inspired with strong nationalist sentiments. It was his evil fate that he was compelled to seek for what had already been completely lost. Treated from the first with discourtesy which the Hofburg would never had dared display during the late king's reign, he was ere long actually regarded with suspicion as a demagogue. At first Metternich employed as negotiator a man utterly ignorant of commercio-political questions, Münch, sworn enemy to Prussia. Without ever condescending to any detailed explanations, Münch was content to reiterate: "Strained relations between Austria and Prussia would throw the whole world out of gear." Münch's place was subsequently taken by Dr. Hock, an able economist, but still occupying so subordinate a position that it was impossible for him to settle any important matters. Kamptz soon realised that he was only being dallied with. He bitterly enquired: "Is it considered to be Prussia's duty to conform in any circumstances with the views that prevail on the Danube and the Neva, even at the expense of domestic peace and of forfeiting the confidence of the other German states? . . . We have in truth still much to do if we are to become once more what we have been in the past." After nearly two

[1] Metternich, Instruction to Trauttmansdorff, January 7; Canitz, Instruction to Arnim, January 13, 1847.

months, in the end of January, 1847, Kamptz left Vienna on the homeward journey, having effected nothing, and being positively afraid that should he stay longer he would be expelled from the Austrian capital.[1] The question was once more debated in the foreign office whether it would not be best to recall Arnim and to suspend diplomatic relations with the Viennese court.[2] But what could be the use of all this, now that the Vienna protocol had been signed, now that the annexation of Cracow had been completed?

After a few weeks of distressing tension, Metternich discovered the right means to appease the enraged Prussians. For a considerable time the court of Berlin had been teasing him with plans for German federal reform, for a German postal system, German weights and measures, and German coinage—empty ideas whereat the chancellor privately smiled, regarding them as "nationalist utopias," though he did not think it expedient to reject them positively. Now, in March, 1847, he sent his confidant, Councillor von Werner, to Berlin as bearer of a memorial concerning a possible German-Austrian commercial union, a document couched in extremely general terms. The foreign office was agreeably surprised. Even Kamptz, much as he had been mortified, advised that the first thing was to secure a settlement of these important national questions; could this be done, the Cracow affair would no longer matter. Canitz, in high glee, wrote to Werner: "Send us as soon as possible a man with whom we can discuss the general question of trade relationships, for in that case we shall not trouble him about Cracow."[3] As Metternich had foreseen, the great commercial union went the way of all federal reforms, for it speedily dissolved into smoke, but the Cracow dispute was safely buried.

The Viennese court maintained its customs system, which was almost tantamount to a frontier embargo. Even the three conditions of the Prussian government, modest as they were, were not honestly fulfilled, for, seeing that henceforward all goods destined for Austria had to pay duty on the frontier, the free depot of Cracow became valueless to Silesian trade. Most of the German merchants closed their branches,

[1] Kamptz, Promemoria for Münch, December 26, 1846; Reports to Canitz, January 10 and 25, 1847.

[2] Privy Councillor von Patow, Reports to Canitz, January 13 and 25, 1847.

[3] Metternich, Instruction to Werner, March 29; Kamptz' Memorial, April 3; Canitz to Werner, April 8, 1847.

and the ancient coronation city, the splendid creation of German burgherdom, whose jettied buildings vividly reminded the observer of the East German towns of Leipzig, Eger, and Breslau, whose churches still contained the royal tombs designed by Veit Stoss and so many other monuments of German art, now fell entirely into the hands of the Poles and the Jews. Thus the destruction of the last refuge of Sarmatian independence ultimately favoured the strengthening of Polish nationalism. Silesia, on the other hand, reckoned its losses in millions, and the discontent thus aroused played its part in the movements of the year of revolution. The court of Berlin was equally weak in its dealings with Russia. In 1846, Paskiewitch, the brutal Warsaw viceroy, demanded that in future Polish political offenders should be handed over upon the mere requisition of the Russian embassy. Although such extradition was excluded by the terms of the treaty, the Prussian government did not refuse the demand, merely asking that in each case a legal condemnation should have taken place or a formal indictment before the courts should have been issued. But in the end, after long resistance, even this stipulation was abandoned, although for those who had to deal with such a neighbour, to surrender the safeguards of the treaty was almost criminal. Yet all this took place under a monarch inspired by enthusiastic devotion for the Poles.

Vis-à-vis the rest of the world the three partitioning powers displayed a united front, being well aware that the legal grounds for their action were far from incontestable. Doubtless the Cracow domain had been conquered by Russia during the War of Liberation, and had subsequently been reconstituted as a neutral republic simply because the three partitioning powers could not come to an agreement upon any other course. But the principal article of the treaty concerning the neutrality and independence of Cracow had subsequently been incorporated in the final act of the Vienna congress (articles 6 et seq.). What was the significance of this in international law? The eastern powers contended that the republic, having been created by them alone, could be annihilated by them alone; all that the other signatories to the congress act had a right to demand was that they should receive official notice of any such alteration. The

view was defended in an ably reasoned memorial by Perthes, the conservative jurist of Bonn; and it was in conformity with the precedents of international law, for the congress act had embodied quite a number of separate treaties, and several of these had already been modified unhesitatingly by voluntary agreement among the contracting parties. Beyond question, moreover, the French crown had no right of veto, for in the peace of Paris the victors had expressly reserved to themselves the power of apportioning the conquered areas without consulting France. Nevertheless there did exist a certain ground for raising legal objections, seeing that the independence of Cracow was, after all, guaranteed by the Vienna treaties. All the more unimpeachable, however, were the political motives which constrained the eastern powers to deal the death blow to a diplomatic abortion which ought never to have been engendered. Metternich had good reason for continually harping on the phrase, "stat pro voluntate necessitas."

Utterly dishonest were the appeals of the western powers to the sanctity of the Vienna treaties, for France in the July revolution and England in the recognition of Belgium had grossly infringed these treaties, and every reflective person must by this time have come to recognise that the march of history could not be eternally arrested by paper barriers. How outrageously, too, had both the western powers sinned against international law in their long-continued complaisance towards the Polish conspirators. For this there had been no excuse. The Versailles Centralisation was openly at work at the very gates of the Tuileries, so that some of the more conservative Parisian papers expressed disapproval. In England, quite recently, Duncombe, an honest radical, had elicited the information that the British government did not merely possess the right of opening correspondence, but made a vigorous use of that right.[1] If, therefore, the Polish rebels remained unmolested, this was because the government wished it. In March, 1846, immediately after the occupation of Cracow, Guizot unctuously exhorted the three powers "to respect treaties, since these are the stablest foundations of conservative policy."[2] After the annexation (December 4th) the French minister lodged

[1] Bunsen's Reports, June 17 and December 14, 1844.
[2] Guizot, Instruction to Rayneval in St. Petersburg, March 24, 1846.

a formal protest, writing: "France might well rejoice at an action which, in accordance with the right of reciprocity, would entitle her henceforward to guide her policy solely by far-seeing calculations regarding her own interests. Yet it is France who reminds the powers of the need for faithfully observing the treaties from which those powers have derived the chief advantage"—and so on, through a mass of verbiage.[1] Canitz had good reason to make mock of this "crude righteousness." He knew of the sordid intrigues upon which the impeccable French minister was at this very time engaged in Madrid, and he knew Louis Philippe's opinion concerning Guizot's moral sermons. The bourgeois monarch, having now to reckon with England's hostility in Spain, was wooing the favour of the Viennese court more sedulously than ever. With his wonted plebeian bluntness he declared to Apponyi: "I have never seen anything stupider than the republic of Cracow. It was the counterpart to that ridiculous phrase concerning the Polish nation, a phrase employed in the French chamber, and one which, despite all my urgent representations, my ministers never had the courage to attack."[2]

The English cabinet, likewise, was far more concerned with Spanish affairs than with the Cracow dispute, in which no British interests were involved. Palmerston, being a humble servant of public opinion, was compelled to participate in the national sport. At this juncture the Poles and the Jews were the spoiled darlings of the London press, and in August the minister informed parliament that if the Vienna treaties were no longer valid on the Vistula, neither were they valid on the Rhine or on the Po! At the same time, talking matters over "in a friendly way" with Brunnow, he enquired what was to be the upshot of this Cracow business. By mutual accommodation it was arranged that England was to protest as soon as the annexation should have taken place, the Russian concluding with the courteous remark: "You will need something to satisfy parliament; we shall be able to furnish it when the time comes."[3] Greatly embittered by Guizot's Spanish

[1] Guizot, Instruction to the marquis of Dalmatie, December 4, with covering letter of December 5, 1846.

[2] Apponyi's Report, November 23, 1846.

[3] Brunnow's Report, August 28, 1846.

intrigues, Palmerston was at this moment least of all inclined to repel the Russian's friendly overtures. The king of Prussia, too, was once more eagerly endeavouring to allure his England into the ranks of the conservative powers. With this end in view he made Leopold Ranke elaborate a memorial, hoping to effect a complete understanding with the London court even before the annexation had taken place. Matters did not, however, get so far as this. When the Vienna conference had made its decision, Palmerston, addressing the eastern powers, expressed his regret that there had been an infringement of the treaties, "an infringement which is not justified by any adequate necessity." The gentle tone of this remonstrance contrasts strangely with the rudeness Palmerston was wont to display in such protests. He was far from desiring to walk hand in hand with France. Indeed, he boasted to Bunsen: "The three powers shall learn how friendly has been my conduct in the Cracow affair, and how positively I have rejected the mischief-making proposals of the French cabinet."[1]

Even Lord Ponsonby, Russia's old enemy, said to Metternich that it was only necessary to act quickly, for the annexation would be condoned as soon as effected—and in the margin of the report King Frederick William wrote complacently: "Noel! Noel! Ouf!"[2] In view of all these things, the inevitable parliamentary clamour was no longer likely to disquiet the eastern powers. When the two houses were to reassemble in January, 1847, Palmerston showed his "dear Brunnow" the reference to Cracow in the queen's speech, and at the Russian's request altered the wording a trifle. But although the phrasing was thus toned down, to the three envoys it still seemed unduly pointed, and Brunnow, writing cordially to the minister, explained: "We would rather not attend the opening of parliament, for if we absent ourselves we shall be able to avoid any exchange of acrimonious despatches."[3]

Bunsen showed himself to be more English than the English ministers. Believing every word he read in the London press, he seriously declared that the British nation

[1] Palmerston, Instruction to Westmoreland, November 23; Bunsen's Report, November 26, 1846.

[2] Arnim's Report, Vienna, November 9, 1846.

[3] Palmerston to Brunnow, January 18; Brunnow's Reply, January 19, 1847.

had not been so fiercely enraged since the days of Napoleon's abuses of power. Not being aware that Austria had been the prime mover in the Cracow matter, he indignantly complained that this poisoned wound had been inflicted upon the Viennese court by Russia.[1] Instead of loyally defending against the foreign world the carefully considered legal outlook of his government, he despatched to Berlin a lengthy memorial which was entirely based upon the superficial chatter of the English journals, and wherein he endeavoured to prove that all the signatories of the congress act had a right to participate in deciding the future of Cracow.[2] Much had to be pardoned to the king's confidant. Ultimately, however, the prolixity of these unsolicited memorials from Bunsen, these documents in which the envoy with didactic assurance expressed his views regarding not England alone[3] but the whole of Europe, could not fail to exasperate the long-suffering minister for foreign affairs. As a practical diplomatist his abilities at any rate greatly exceeded those of the envoy in London, and at length he wrote gently: "It is occasionally borne in upon me to ask myself whether perchance a historian like Ranke may not some day happen upon our archives, and may not study them to see how far they harmonise with what he can glean from the newspapers, or to what extent he may gain from them new lights as to the history of our days. Should such a man come across your excellency's memorials concerning the English, French, Spanish, and Polish questions, after rejoicing over his find and exploiting it to the full, it will perhaps occur to him in addition to ask what the then minister for foreign affairs may have had to say thereanent. Will it not seem to him at times that it must really have been necessary to warn this poor blinded man, lest he should ruin all, lest through his lack of understanding Prussia should pass from a position offering brilliant prospects to one of absolute desperation? Would it not seem to such an observer that amid all the dangers threatening the fatherland, that of French conquest, that of Russian oppression, that of Austrian obstruction, and that of universal lack of confidence, the

[1] Bunsen's Reports, November 24 and December 15, 1846.

[2] Bunsen, A Study of the Cracow Question from the material Standpoint, 1846.

[3] Bunsen, The Complications in the internal Affairs of Great Britain, July 13, 1843.

foreign minister must have been no better than a deaf-mute and a hopeless paralytic?" [1]

In such circumstances the eastern powers could assume a proud and confident bearing. Canitz, in a circular despatch to the envoys (November 29th), developed the ideas which had guided the king's actions in the matter. He concluded with the assurance that there no longer existed anything in Posen to lead to further uprisings, that such disorders as had occurred had been fomented from without, and that "it is consequently of paramount importance to us not to tolerate a focus of disturbance on the frontiers of Prussia, but rather to reconstruct it as a protectorate or wardship, seeing that, by impudent rebellion, the republic of Cracow has destroyed itself." [2] Metternich expressed similar views in several despatches. This republic, he maintained, had constrained its founders to consider what they owed to themselves and to their people. He even ventured to add: "The congress act can only be strengthened by the Cracow affair." [3] Nesselrode laid particular stress upon the fact that the Polish refugees had from the first made a base use of the republic and were therefore accountable for its destruction.[4] When the three powers had once again (January 4, 1847), and in identical despatches, given vent to their opinions, the diplomatic struggle was brought to a close. The war of words, which still continued to rage in Paris and in London, was no longer of importance. The world was surfeited with the Polish drama. Lord George Bentinck, Disraeli, and other fervent tories, even ventured to affirm that they were convinced of the political necessity of the Polish coup de main.

Despite this easy diplomatic victory, the two German powers felt uneasy. It mattered not what they asseverated. By the forcible annihilation of a universally recognised European state, the inalienable right of legitimacy, a right which Austria and Prussia had so often and so solemnly upheld, had been more grossly infringed than in any of the revolutions or territorial changes wrought in the last few decades. The lesser German courts were therefore seized with an anxiety

[1] Canitz to Bunsen, January 13, 1847.

[2] Canitz, Circular Despatch to the envoys, November 29, 1846.

[3] Metternich, Circular Despatches to the envoys, November 18 and 29, 1846, together with a Memorial: The Decisions of the three Powers in Regard to Cracow.

[4] Nesselrode, Circular Despatch to the embassies, November 20 (old style), 1846.

which was readily comprehensible. Meiningen and Sondershausen rested upon no firmer legal foundation than had the whilom Cracow, and they felt as little able to assert themselves. Some of the federal envoys of the small states even anxiously questioned the French representative, Chasseloup-Laubat.[1] Metternich clearly recognised that he had involved himself in terrible contradictions. In order to pacify the pygmies and at the same time to prove to the whole world how staunch he was to his principles, he conceived a fresh idea, for which the frigid self-righteousness of his dotage could alone account. After long negotiation, he agreed with Canitz in issuing the following declaration: "Every treaty that possesses full legal validity is entitled to be observed by all the signatories with reciprocal fidelity. . . . Your majesties cannot however admit that a treaty can exist without the conjunction of mutual rights and obligations, nor that the limits of these rights and obligations can be arbitrarily extended without the knowledge of the contracting parties, nor yet that they can be limited by the interference of non-contracting parties, nor, finally, that they can be altered in any way."[2]

This declaration was to be endorsed by the Bundestag, just as the decisions of the Verona congress had been endorsed by that body, and despite the fact that the Germanic Federation had no direct concern with Cracow. But the days of Troppau and Verona were over. Notwithstanding Canitz' insistence that the declaration appeared to be necessary, seeing that, as he wrote, "the Germanic Federation is a firm prop for the maintenance of international law,"[3] the German courts could not but feel that any such glorification of faithfulness to a bond had a pharisaical sound at the very moment when the Vienna treaties were unquestionably being modified. Moreover, they all trembled for their own existence. Ultimately the Bavarian government was willing to agree to the proposal, on the ground that "the essence of the Germanic Federation consists mainly in the reciprocity of treaty rights." An unambiguously worded wish was, however, added, to the effect that there should be no special approval of what had been done with regard to the republic of Cracow, and that consequently a recognition of the principles which had animated

[1] Dönhoff's Report, Frankfort, December 12, 1846.
[2] Metternich, Instructions to Trauttmansdorff, March 7, April 8, 1847.
[3] Canitz, Circular Despatch to the German Embassies, April 7, 1847.

Austria and Prussia should be recorded only in respect of the application of these principles to the affairs of the Germanic Federation.[1] Zeschau, the Saxon minister, spoke very frankly to Kuefstein, the Austrian envoy, saying: "I admit the necessity of what has been done, but I trust that such measures as were taken against Cracow will never be enforced against any other state, even the smallest." Metternich thereupon gave him the most solemn assurance that the emperor was animated "by the profoundest respect for every treaty right," and he expressed the hope that the Germanic Federation would "unite with Austria and Prussia in serene homage for the eternal principles of international law"—empty words which, at such a moment, the honest Saxon could not fail to regard as rank hypocrisy.[2]

Canitz was ashamed in his secret heart, and he observed gloomily: "We cannot talk to the customs union governments about fidelity to treaties when the court of Vienna is dealing with customs affairs in Cracow in so arbitrary a fashion"[3] Unanimous reports poured in from the envoys in all the German territories. Dissatisfaction, they said, was rife; the conservatives were complaining even more loudly than the sarmatiophil liberals, and were saying that the old system of immutable legitimism had pronounced its own doom.[4] Among the governments of the middle-sized states, no more than four were perfectly friendly to the annexation: Hanover, the two Hesses, and Würtemberg, where the king now thought only of fighting the revolution.[5] A great deal of private persuasion was necessary before the presidential envoy could at length venture to bring the two powers' declaration formally before the Bundestag on June 17, 1847. In most of the votes it was easy enough to perceive that they were unwillingly given. The resolution definitely stated that the Federation had noted with gratitude and complete agreement "the exposition of the principles of conscientious observance of treaties." The irritability of the envoys was accentuated

[1] Minister von Maurer, Verbal Note to Bernstorff, April 20; Instruction to the acting federal envoy Blittersdorff, April 19, 1847.

[2] Metternich, Instruction to Kuefstein, April 26, 1847.

[3] Canitz to Count Arnim, March 12, 1847.

[4] Radowitz' Report, Carlsruhe, December 10, 1846; Seckendorff's Report, Hanover, December 14, 1846; Bernstorff's Report, Munich, February 1, 1847; Dönhoff's Report, Frankfort, April 24, 1847.

[5] Thun's Report, Stuttgart, May 2, 1847.

when, at the close of the sitting, the president read a missive from the Russian representative announcing the czar's approval of the principles animating the German great powers. The Bundestag was no longer in the mood to allow itself to be treated in a style reminiscent of Verona days. Without expressing any thanks it "took note" of the czar's missive, and subsequently decided to bury the whole affair in a secret minute.[1] The promulgation of the protocol was entrusted to the two great powers, and followed in due course, but passed almost unnoticed. The aims of the court of Vienna had been wellnigh completely frustrated, for instead of a formal approval from united Germany, nothing more had been secured than a quasi-ironical declaration concerning the sacrosanctity of treaties. Austrian influence was declining, and Metternich's arts had ceased to be effective even at the Bundestag. Shortly afterwards the kingdom of Poland was incorporated within the Russian customs lines. This arbitrary measure was an inevitable sequel of all that had happened previously, and was positively advantageous to Polish economic life, but none the less it afforded a fresh proof of what was to be expected from the eastern powers in the way of the observance of treaties.

Throughout the whole course of the Polish incidents the three partitioning powers had plainly displayed their several political dispositions. In Russian Poland the mailed fist reigned supreme; the few who ventured upon an armed rising were promptly hanged or disappeared—probably Siberia swallowed them up. The Austrian government gazed helplessly while the raging populace butchered the Polish rebels. In Posen the uprising was quelled almost without bloodshed, and the broad masses of the people remained quiet. Germandom, flanked by ownership and culture, strode ever forward and took no heed of Polish plots. Not until much later, in the year 1861, did the tragical counter-stroke take place. Through Prussia's schools, Prussia's free trade policy, and Prussia's agrarian legislation, a Polish middle class came into being by degrees in town and country alike, a middle class which was fated to repay its benefactor with ingratitude. At the moment, however, Germandom seemed assured of a brilliant future.

It was a curious fact that now for the second time Polish

[1] Dönhoff's Report, June 17, 1847.

troubles were to influence the development of Prussian legal procedure. Under Frederick William II, the Frederician code, long since discarded, had been promulgated simply because the new province which had been created by the partition of Poland required an ordered administration of justice. The present king was seriously troubled as to the fate of the two hundred and fifty-four Poles who had been selected for prosecution from out the mass of arrested persons by the commission of enquiry; Frederick William wished to guarantee them the benefit of a public and oral trial in order to curtail the proceedings and to prove to the world that Prussia's actions were guided by justice alone. For years, discussions concerning the introduction of public procedure in criminal cases had been occupying the ministries for justice; but the Polish revolt enforced the acceptance of a reform that had long been desiderated. Whilst Savigny was still immersed in his erudite investigations, the king commissioned Uhden, the under-minister for justice, to draft a law whereby public procedure could immediately be inaugurated in the Berlinese law-courts. It was certainly doubtful whether the suggested law could be introduced for the trial of the Poles, for these cases were to be tried before the supreme court; nay, the cases had already come up for trial in Posen several months earlier, and could the law be applied retrospectively? The prince of Prussia, to whom any imprecision in the law was peculiarly irritating, now gave vent to his feelings in a lively manner. "Such ill-advised steps," he said, "which seem quite arbitrary, have an incalculable influence and should be most carefully avoided."[1] Kleist, president of the supreme court, expressed himself in similar terms. The king, however, was not to be diverted from his magnanimous intentions, and subscribed the law on July 17, 1846. He wished to expedite the decision, and his ministers foresaw that the Polish conspirators would be more likely to forfeit public esteem if compelled to answer for their actions in open court.[2]

In March, 1847, the results of the intricate examination were communicated to the crown prosecutor attached to the supreme court; and on August 2nd the great Polish trial began in the hall of the new Moabite prison. This was the

[1] The prince of Prussia to King Frederick William, May 23; Kleist, Promemoria, April, 1846.

[2] Uhden, Memorial concerning the Polish Trials, October 8, 1847.

first public trial to take place in Prussia's old provinces, and was described by Deycks, counsel for the defence, as "an event of the utmost importance to ourselves, to Europe, and to the world." The hall was packed from earliest morn, and the crowd noisily demonstrated its sympathy for the accused, for it was incumbent upon every enlightened Berliner to love the Polish rebels. In the course of the preliminary examination, the chief culprit, Microslawski, had been led to make inculpatory admissions by the artful police director Duncker, a man who was the terror of the Berlinese gamins. Mieroslawski was therefore compelled to keep fairly close to the truth during the proceedings before the supreme court, and thereby caused much annoyance to his co-defendants. Notwithstanding the law to the contrary, Mieroslawski was actually permitted to speak French, for this leader of the Polish nation was really not proficient in his native tongue; besides, he shrewdly reckoned that a French speech would be understood by a portion of the eager listeners, whereas the audience would necessarily be bored by a Polish harangue translated sentence by sentence. The magnificent catchwords which he spouted forth in fluent French, and emphasised with copious gesticulations, appealed more to the Polish gentry than to the fastidious Berlinese who had read many similar outbursts in the papers. None of the customary metaphors were lacking: the ill-fated womb which had given birth to the victim of oppression; the raven of calumny upon the Polish cross; the nation which had hung for a whole century on the cross with naught but gall and vinegar to drink. Microslawski had never harboured any evil designs against Prussia; the occupation of the Posen fortress was merely to be a means for the capture of Russian Poland. With touching eloquence he showed what a glorious part Prussia might play, should she so determine, in winning back the other Polish lands for the Poles, so as to make some amends for the territory which had fallen to her share. "Prussia will have to befriend the rising power which alone is in a position to withstand the threatening spectre of panslavism."

Thus did the deadly enemy of Prussia intone the siren's song which from that day until the present has been sung in various ways to the good-natured Germans. Fortunately Marquis Wielopolski now wrote an open letter to Metternich in which the precisely opposite argument was maintained,

and wherein, after lively recriminations against Austrian misgovernment, he concluded by saying: "The only possible future for Poland is to link up with the great panslavic family. Instead of allowing the country to become weak through foolish emigration, Poland must aim at keeping her people peacefully at home; then, when the right time comes, she will place herself under the leadership of her magnanimous enemy, the Romanoff dynasty, and march beneath the banner of a united Slavic nationality." This open letter was most unpalatable to the democratic Posen gentry, whereas among the magnates of Russian Poland the wealthy marquis was held in higher esteem than Mieroslawski, and the panslavic idea was popular among the lesser nobility of Warsaw. Which of the two Polish apostles was the German nation to believe? Against such neighbours the only policy to adopt was one of vigilant severity.

By undignified lying, Mieroslawski's comrades in misfortune alienated the sympathy which is ever extended to political offenders. It was manifest that they had agreed to deny nearly everything, and the hall, which at first had been overcrowded, emptied itself as the proceedings dragged on. The trial ended on November 17th. The monotonous repetition of wilful and impertinent denial and exaggeration was warranted to disgust German hearers. Personal commiseration was aroused by two of the accused alone: Dr Libelt, a clever, pale little man who was nicknamed "the patriarch" by his compatriots, and Niegolewski, a young man of fiery disposition. The other conspirators proved to be dull and frivolous. Some of the audience felt a special loathing for the men who had begged for and been granted a pardon by the late king for a previous offence and had been unable to keep faith. The facts of the case were clear enough: the evidence showed beyond doubt that this widely ramified and madcap conspiracy had had as its conscienceless goal to wrest Posen and West Prussia from the monarchy. President Koch and the other judges maintained a dignified demeanour which contrasted favourably with the impassioned tone adopted at French political trials. The prosecution was likewise conducted with much decorum by Privy Councillor Wentzel. Among the counsel for the defence, Deycks made himself conspicuous by his reckless language. He affirmed that the Prussian state was alone responsible for the criminals and for the crime. Lewald, an

enlightened opponent of the "policy of Germanisation," adopted suaver methods, as did also his colleague Crelinger, a member of Jacoby's circle. All these men endeavoured to show that the Poles had merely followed Prussia's lead, for, thanks to liberal myths, it had already been forgotten that the German War of Liberation had not been an insurrection but a war. Judgment was delivered on December 2nd. The code was very leniently interpreted, and the charge of high treason was dismissed, for the court ruled that the forcible detachment of a few portions of territory did not constitute "the overthrow of the state constitution." The accused were therefore merely convicted of treason against their country. Eight of the prisoners were condemned to death; one hundred and nine were sentenced, some to penal servitude, and some to imprisonment in a fortress; one hundred and sixteen, in whose case the evidence did not suffice for a conviction, were bound over; and only eighteen were acquitted.

If the king had now allowed justice to take its course, and had at least permitted the execution of the light-minded leader of the rebels, he would perhaps have spared the land of Posen the shedding of much innocent blood. Mieroslawski expected no better fate. Far from putting in a plea for clemency, as had been hoped at court, he said bluntly: "The king will have to have me executed owing to the gravity of my offence. If he lets us go, we shall only begin again—or at any rate I shall!" But the soft-hearted monarch could not bring himself to so stringent a decision. Moreover, he quite failed to understand the situation in Posen, being unaware that the Poles, by no means discouraged on account of their bloodless defeat, were rubbing their hands gleefully, and were confidently saying: "After all, the good king will not permit any executions!" The condemned men remained for the time being in captivity, and within a few months Prussia was to learn once again how the Poles liked to repay the Germans for their generosity.

§ 3. THE OPEN LETTER. THE REVOLT OF SCHLESWIG-HOLSTEIN.

Public opinion in Germany had not yet arrived at a stable judgment concerning recent events in Poland, for national pride and cosmopolitan folly still hung in equipoise. But now, when

our northern march was threatened by a foreign power, a splendid unanimity was displayed by the nation, which proved full of youthful self-confidence. Frederick VI of Denmark died in December, 1839, shortly before the king of Prussia, and in Denmark as in Prussia a new era opened with the new reign. The deceased ruler had been the first among the kings of the island realm to be inspired by purely Danish sentiments; but he loved tranquillity, and was loath to allow the struggles of the parties to disturb the peace of his declining years. But when Christian VIII succeeded him on the throne the national desires, hitherto repressed with difficulty, at once found stormy expression.

King Christian, a pupil of Hoegh-Guldberg, was a thorough Dane, although well able to appreciate the value of German culture. Man of the world and bon viveur, fond of display, enjoying the pleasures of the table, and delighting in lively conversation, he charmed all who came in contact with him by his suave and ingratiating manners—unless perchance, as occasionally happened, his hot temper mastered him. For many years he had been president of the academy, and in this position had done yeoman's service on behalf of the arts. Students of natural science prized his mineralogical writings on Vesuvius. He corresponded with a number of scholars, but among these Baron von Rumohr, epicure and connoisseur, was most congenial. Versatile and receptive, in many respects Christian's character resembled that of Frederick William IV. The two monarchs were fond of one another, and their friendship with Rumohr was an additional link between them. In the first happy days of expectation Humboldt had delightfully declared that two such kings could worthily esteem one another. The talented Dane, however, fell behind Frederick William in respect of the breadth of his education and the wealth of his ideas. A dilettante in all things, he lacked likewise the German ruler's goodness of heart, and whereas the king of Prussia would at times only convey a theatrical impression through the fanciful exuberance of his utterances, King Christian made it his positive aim to dazzle and to beguile by the arts of the stage. Every year at the opening of the session of the supreme court of justice, clad in a fancy uniform of red velvet and decked with glittering orders, he looked the perfect player-king. Nor did he hesitate to avail himself of the cheapest effects. For example, when Rudolf Schleiden

was under arrest in the fortress of Nyborg, kept in duress there on account of a foolish duel devoid of political significance, the king suddenly made his appearance like a god from a machine to convey a formal announcement of royal clemency. He was swayed by no one's influence, for he believed himself endowed with a share of the mysterious "kingcraft" of the Stuarts, and he looked down with unexpressed contempt upon the lesser mortals among whom he moved. Adler, secretary to the cabinet, who from Christian's youth upward had accompanied him in all the divagations of Scandinavian policy, was his only confidant. He shrank from bold ventures and speedy decisions, but clung tenaciously to his secret designs, for it was his hope to realise them by degrees through playing artfully upon human weakness. He had neither veneration for the right nor faith in the moral forces of history, and for these reasons he was likewise devoid of understanding for the national sentiments of his subjects.

Consequently, despite his diplomatic cunning, he was no statesman. Hoping to become a second Waldemar Atterdag, his eight years' reign paved the way for the struggles which were to destroy the united state of Denmark. His intrigues had secured for him in earlier days a few months' tenure of the Norwegian throne, and at this time, reluctantly enough, he had subscribed the constitution which thenceforward remained the ideal of all liberal Scandinavians. Subsequently for a considerable period he was reputed to possess radical sentiments, simply because it had chanced upon a journey that he had become involved in the Neapolitan revolution, and had followed the doings of the carbonari with considerable interest.[1] In later years he arrived at an outlook on the world which was closely akin to the ideas of King Frederick William. Although he had no strong religious feeling, it seemed to him that the Hegelian philosophy was dangerous to the common weal, but the pious natural-philosophical reveries of his fellow-countryman Steffens appeared to him comparatively free from danger. As successor to the Danish autocrats he desiderated a free and strong crown, for the ruler's powers were not to be restricted by the interference of the estates, or they were to be restricted only so far as was rendered absolutely indispensable by the spirit of the age. Since the Danish provincial diets had been modelled upon those of Prussia,

[1] See vol. II, p. 81; vol. III, p. 484.

Christian determined to imitate his Prussian friend's reforms step by step. He proposed, like Frederick William, to establish first of all united committees, and subsequently to create a united diet for the entire monarchy. In his dealings with such a Reichstag, the king could be guided by the maxim "divide et impera," he could play the parties and the nations one against another, could counteract the radicalism of the Danes by the conservatisim of the Schleswig-Holsteiners and the Germanism of the duchies by the Danism of the islands.

All these plans were, however, still nebulous so long as the very existence of the united state remained insecure. Now that the Augustenburgs had formally advanced a claim to Schleswig-Holstein, anxiety concerning the question of the succession had been imperiously forced upon the king.[1] Frederick, Christian's only son, remained childless. The crown prince's second marriage, like the first, ended in a divorce after a few years, the husband's bearishness having proved intolerable to the wife, and he declined to enter into a third royal marriage.[2] Another royal prince, King Christian's brother, elderly and childless, was also living. As far as human foresight could go, the death of Crown Prince Frederick would involve the extinction of the royal line and the disintegration of the united state of Denmark, for in the duchies, in accordance with the ancient territorial law, the succession must pass in the male line to the Augustenburgs, whereas in Denmark, by the king's law, the right of succession would continue through the female line. If the king wished to avert this danger from his realm, he would have to induce one line or the other to consent to a voluntary renunciation of the succession, and by all the traditions of his house and by all the calculations of a prudent statesmanship, such renunciation was only to be expected from those whose claim was on the distaff side. In the previous century the whole of northern Europe, embracing Russia and the three crowns of Scandinavia, had belonged to the house of Holstein-Oldenburg. Sweden and Norway had now been lost, and it would seem like dynastic suicide if an Oldenburg king should attempt to raise to the Danish throne a princely stock unknown to the north

The next heir on the distaff side (presumably, but not certainly, since the cognate succession is invariably more dubious

[1] See vol. V, pp. 213 and 214.
[2] Schoultz-Ascheraden's Report, May 10, 1846.

than the agnate) was the king's brother-in-law, Princess Charlotte's husband, Landgrave William. William's heir was his son, Landgrave Frederick of Hesse, a vain and empty-headed young fellow who, with a dislike for serious-minded men and serious conversation, wasted his time in futile pleasures, and was considered of no account in Copenhagen. Apart from this, Landgrave Frederick was rightful heir to the throne of Hesse-Cassel, and how could any Danish king desire to complicate yet further the involved affairs of his united state by a personal union with Electoral Hesse? In view of the proverbial avarice of the house of Brabant it seemed by no means unlikely that for a handsome monetary consideration the Hessians might be induced to renounce their hereditary claims, more especially since the claim was by no means incontestable. Could this be secured, all the territorial possessions of the Danish monarchy could be retained under the sway of the male stock of the house of Oldenburg. If by the favour of the German great powers the landgrave of Hesse could in addition be granted the title of king of Hesse, thus acquiring the greatly desired kingship of the Catti, it was practically certain that he would be willing to forfeit his claim to Denmark, whereas the Augustenburgs had repeatedly declared that nothing would ever induce them to abandon their rights in Schleswig-Holstein.[1]

Thus simply could matters have been disposed of if the king had acted with impartiality. But again it was manifest how strongly the fate of nations is determined by leading men and their personal susceptibilities. Christian harboured against the duke of Augustenburg a hatred which was deep and very natural. For his ambitious and intriguing sister, however, Landgravine Charlotte, the declared enemy of Schleswig-Holstein, he cherished a no less hearty affection. For her sake he determined to maintain the united state under the Hessian house. What cared he for the law? He made up his mind to gain the impossible end by crooked means. In order to secure his Hessian relatives as powerful supporters for his scheme he brought about the marriage of Landgrave Frederick with one of the czar's daughters, Grand Duchess Alexandrina. Fate shattered his hopes. A short time after her marriage,

[1] Among other sources I make use here of a memorial by Count von Bülow, Councillor to Legation, an able and well-informed man (Notes on Copenhagen, for General Gerlach, Berlin, February, 1848).

the grand duchess died, her death following close upon that of her only child. The landgrave immediately put up her estate to auction, and Nicholas could avert a public scandal only by buying the estate secretly. The czar could never forget this example of unprincely avarice, and henceforward showed scant interest in the claims of his childless son-in-law.

In home politics the king was at first very cautious. He did not wish to compromise himself with any of the parties, and he determined to be the only arbiter. He politely refused to consider the appeals for liberty of the press and the extension of representative rights which, immediately upon his accession, were sent in to him by the kingdom as well as by the duchies. The ancient privileges of Schleswig-Holstein were, however, reaffirmed; to the astonishment of everyone, the brother of the duke of Augustenburg, Prince Frederick of Noer, received the post of governor of the duchies; and Count Joseph Reventlow-Criminil, who was well known for his staunch German sentiments, was given the presidency of the Schleswig-Holstein chancellery. On the other hand, it soon became evident that Christian intended little by little to Danify his German possessions. The old regiments were broken up into battalions; the historic flag bearing the ducal arms was replaced by the Danebrog; a portion of the Schleswig-Holstein troops was transferred to Jutland and the islands. The promotion of officers was not to take place within the respective regiments, but through the army as a whole, and since the Germans would seldom go for training to the Copenhagen cadet school the officers' corps soon came to consist chiefly of Danes, and the navy was officered entirely by Danes. Instead of the long-desired national bank the duchies had to content themselves with a branch of the Danish Reichsbank in Flensburg; they did not dare to demand more. At the same time, Danish money was introduced, but the king was afraid to make its exclusive use compulsory. The Schleswig-Holsteiners therefore held obstinately to their Lübeck shillings, and sent such masses of Danish copper coins to the Teutoburg forest that Bandel was able to mint an arm for his Arminius statue from the plethora. Whereas Prussia hoped for the entry of Schleswig-Holstein into the customs union, and had repeatedly sent in requests to this effect, Christian thought rather of raising the customs barrier between Jutland and the duchies and thereby securing customs unity for his realm. This

idea, however, never got beyond the preliminary stage. Likewise, and in consequence of German opposition, the plan for the inauguration of a joint supreme authority for church and school came to naught.

How little did the king know his Danes when he imagined that he could satisfy them by such tentative expedients. National passion was unchained, and raged like a hurricane athwart the island realm. It seemed as if the proud little nation, already fallen from its high estate, dreaded the approach of final destruction and was convulsively endeavouring to regain the heights. Strange indeed was it to see how the Danes, whose civic life was in general so worthy of respect, now in their savage germanophobia lost all sense of shame and all regard for appearances. In 1840, when the Holsteiners wished to commemorate the five hundredth anniversary of the death of their national hero Gerhard the Great by the erection of a statue, a society was formed in Denmark which seriously proposed to put up a monument to Niels Ebbesen of Randers, the Danish murderer of Gerhard. The recently formed party of the Eiderdanes soon spread throughout the country, its watchword being: One Denmark from the Eider to the Sound, united in tongue, customs, and law. These zealots would not at first venture to show their designs against Holstein, for they dreaded the opposition of the Germanic Federation, whilst they hoped that at a later date this German territory might come to form part of the enlarged state of Denmark. Schleswig, however, was to be annexed forthwith, was to be completely Danified, and was to be presented by Denmark as a nuptial gift to the league of the three Scandinavian crowns. The old idea of the Calmar union which had again and again been frustrated by the national enmities of the three "brother nations," and had been wrecked by the mutual jealousies of their capitals, was revived. Many of the youthful enthusiasts secretly believed that King Oscar of Sweden, the popular and liberal scion of the house of Bernadotte, would secure the hegemony in the Scandinavian union

The whole party was united in the resolve to extirpate the Germandom of Schleswig and to disrupt the union of the two German duchies. Orla Lehmann threateningly exclaimed: "We are equally ready to defend our ancient Denmark against the traitorous clamour of the Nordalbingians and against the

sea-craving lust of conquest of all the German fowlers. Should need arise, with our swords we will write on their backs the bloody legend, 'Denmark will not have it so!'" Lehmann's words gave expression to the frenzied passion of the renegade, for he was a Schleswiger by birth, son of a respected Schleswig-Holstein official. Soon, however, there flocked to his standard all the aspiring elements of the Danish bourgeoisie: the turbulent students of the capital; the members of the professorial families, closely interconnected by blood and by marriage, whose professional opportunities were restricted because Kiel, Copenhagen's old rival, was exclusively entitled to train candidates for official posts in Schleswig-Holstein; the merchants and shipowners for whom the journal *Fädrelandet* served as an eloquent mouthpiece; and, in addition, almost all the ablest men among the younger civil servants and officers. Distinguished by their fanaticism were Madvig, the erudite philologian, Tscherning, a captain in the army, and Clausen and Monrad, the theologians. All their utterances came from the heart, and they were all firmly convinced that they stood in the foremost files of time.

Just as the Eiderdanes trampled upon the historic rights of the German duchies, so did they demand a radical change in the Danish realm. The selfsame democratic forces which had, one hundred and eighty years earlier during the Copenhagen revolution, brought the king's law into being, a law whereby the nobles had been subjected to the crown, were now tending to abolish the autocracy of the king's law by introducing an unlimited parliamentarism. The example of Norway, and the writings of the French, with whom for years past the Danes had been on friendly terms, had a powerful influence in moulding the ideas of this young Scandinavian democracy. Many hoped to win over a portion of the German Schleswig-Holsteiners by the splendid promises of liberalism. Since hatred of the nobility was deeply implanted in the heart of the Danish countryfolk, and since they had never forgotten the name of Christian II, the royal "friend of the people," it was not to be wondered at that the assemblies of peasants should give their approval to the libertarian doctrines of the radical metropolis. The whole movement was from its inception of a noisy and impetuous nature, which coincided with the lively character of the North European city. Banquets, feasts, commemorative meetings, and processions, followed one upon

the other in a continuous stream; even the obsequies of Thorwaldsen were made an excuse for so pugnacious a display of the Danish spirit that the Schleswig-Holsteiners were constrained to hold aloof. Young men from the university flocked over the Sound in order to fraternise with their Swedish fellow-students; the visit was returned by the Swedes, and was ceremoniously welcomed by Orla Lehmann's recently founded Scandinavian Society. At the great Scandinavian congress of natural philosophers, the prince of Canino, a Napoleonid who had thrown himself into the arms of international democracy, hailed the union of the three crowns of the free north; and when King Oscar graced the meeting in person, joy knew no bounds.

When, in 1837, Orla Lehmann began his public career, he was openly opposed by the distinguished old Danish historian Gustav Ludwig Baden, who advised Lehmann to learn from Jacob Baden the philologian (Gustav Baden's father) that it would be "a heinous sin" to separate Schleswig from Holstein. But after a few years such voices from the realm of justice did not venture to make themselves heard. A conservative united state party came into existence. This party held that the monarchy, no matter under what ruling house, must be kept undiminished in size, and that the peculiar rights of the duchies, though they might be somewhat curtailed, were not to be destroyed. To this party belonged nearly all the old officials, Danes as well as Germans; but it never took root among the people. Leaders without an army, these men could only reckon on the unreliable king who at one and the same moment had Orla Lehmann haled before the supreme court as an agitator, and expressed his approval of the Danish propaganda.

The first aim of the Eiderdanes was the conquest of North Schleswig. In order to spread the Danish tongue and Danish customs in this quiet land, six different societies were founded in the course of a few years. A loquacious peasant, Laurids Skau by name, was the leader of these machinations; he travelled ceaselessly to and fro between Flensburg and Copenhagen, and was even graciously received by the monarch. He was valiantly supported by seven Copenhagen demagogues, who were nicknamed "the Pleiades" by the Schleswigers. Results were slow of achievement; the dull-witted, goodnatured peasants of North Schleswig had no grounds for complaint against the Germans, and the local

cattle trade with Hamburg was flourishing. But little by little the seed of discontent began to spring up. Laurids Skau was wont to hold his great popular festivals in the extreme north-east of Schleswig. He had chosen for this purpose the Skamlingsbank, a lovely wooded eminence overlooking the Little Belt and within easy reach by water of Jutland and the islands. Many a simple peasant was enthralled on these occasions when he heard the Danish national anthem rising on the air, or when the orators in fiery speeches hailed the northern trinity, the three in one, or again when a Danish patriot was presented with a silver drinking-horn. Nevertheless German culture had so strong a grip upon the countryfolk of North Schleswig that the Danish party made but slow progress with propaganda.

The diets could not ignore this stormy patriotic movement. Hitherto elected by direct suffrage, these bodies had faithfully given expression to the popular will, and had done this despite their restricted privileges. If Prussia, which had so much firmer a footing, found it difficult to cope with the exigencies of the provincial diets, far more intricate was the task in this mixed realm where the two Danish diets were at open war with the two German diets, thus proving to all the world that in national differences the people are always more impatient than the cabinets. The Jutlanders began the attack. When in the Schleswig diet of 1842 a staunch Danish deputy, who had often before spoken excellent German, suddenly began to hold forth in Danish and was consequently called to order, the Jutish diet at Viborg sent in a solemn protest, thereby exceeding its rights. The quarrel lasted long; at length the king commanded that the Schleswig estates should only speak Danish when they were not proficient in the German language. Simultaneously the Jutlanders were praised for their unconstitutional zeal, and the Schleswigers were rebuked for their legitimate defence. After many similar pin-pricks, Allgreen Ussing, the burgomaster of Copenhagen, determined to propose the following motion in the Zealand diet at Rotschild: the king shall publicly proclaim the indivisibility of the Danish state and forbid any attack upon it. The motion was accepted with one dissentient; even Minister Oersted, Denmark's greatest jurist, expressed himself as practically in agreement, although the proposal exceeded the competence of advisory provincial diets. Therewith did the Danes declare war upon the ancient privileges

of Schleswig-Holstein, and the decision was all the more ominous in that it had been proposed by a statesman of moderate views and not by a democratic Eiderdane.

These encroachments on the part of their neighbours suddenly awakened the slumbering political energies of Schleswig-Holstein, energies which had been no more than gently stimulated even by Lornsen's boldness. How tranquilly heretofore had the course of life run in this land of happy marriages, where everyone was content in the narrow circle of occupation and the family, where people all knew one another, where even those well on in years were delighted because others could recall that, long before, they had passed their examinations "in the second division, but specially commended." But now that the indivisibility of the duchies was endangered, now that the old charters were threatened, it was as if a thunder-clap had burst upon the quiet world, and Germany learned with astonishment how much pride and talent were to be found among these valiant dwellers on the frontier. Previously, when the question of the succession still seemed remote, the Schleswig-Holsteiners had troubled themselves little about the matter. Even Dahlmann and Falck had long continued to believe that for Schleswig, too, the succession specified in the king's law would prevail. But at length people had begun to realise that in the contrast of the two methods of succession was to be found the legal means for preserving Germandom from Danish tyranny. Precisely at the right moment Georg Beseler issued Lornsen's posthumous work *Concerning the Constitution of the Union,* and the splendid utterances of this ever-memorable man could not fail to make their appeal to all German hearts. Lornsen insisted that Schleswig-Holstein must be independent, connected with Denmark solely by a personal union. Should the royal line die out, the liberated northern march must enter the Germanic Federation. Subsequently Carl Samwer, a young lawyer, published an exhaustive study entitled *The Right of Succession in the Duchies of Schleswig-Holstein.*

Thenceforward all Germans were agreed in the opinion that in the inseparable duchies the male stock alone enjoyed the right of succession. Theodor Olshausen and his radical friends had for a long time, though with little support, been advocating in the *Kieler Korrespondenzblatt* the remarkable and quite unhistorical view that Schleswig ought to be sacrificed

in order to bind Holstein all the more closely to liberal Germany. As soon, however, as the attacks of the Danes became a serious menace, these "new Holsteiners" honourably abandoned their separatist opinions, and joined forces around the banner of territorial right. Except for a few parts of northern Schleswig, the whole people was united, for the movement permeated the masses with astonishing speed. As early as July, 1844, prior to Allgreen Ussing's appearance upon the scene, there was heard for the first time at the Schleswig choral festival the *Song of Chemnitz:* "Schleswig-Holstein, sea-encircled, of German lore the guardian true!" Taking the four colours of Schleswig-Holstein, and discarding the yellow, there was fashioned the new blue-red-and-white flag of the single sea-girt land. Three tints were indispensable, for at this epoch no struggle for freedom was conceivable without a tricolour; and, despite all prohibitions, this particular specimen of the genus was continually turning up.

The territory had a firm and honest belief in its independence and its indivisibility, and equally so in the right of succession of the male stock. In actual fact, the hereditary claims of the Augustenburgs rested upon as stable a legal foundation as was possible in the case of rights dating from the confused history of distant centuries. The indivisibility of the duchies had again and again been solemnly confirmed by the crown of Denmark, whereas the king's law, and the new succession ordinance based thereon, had never been promulgated as a law in Schleswig-Holstein. Serious doubts as to the precise legal position could, however, arise only in respect of the lordship of Pinneberg and the county of Rantzau. This portion of Holstein, constituting the environs of Altona, had not participated in the momentous ducal election of the year 1460. At that epoch, a free allodium, it had belonged to one of the collateral lines of the old Schauenburg counts. When this family died out in 1640, the region was jointly purchased by the royal line and the Gottorp line. Subsequently, after numerous vicissitudes, it had passed wholly under the rule of the royal line, and ultimately, in 1806, had been incorporated into the duchy of Holstein. Here from ancient days had dealt the bailiff of Pinneberg and the administrator of the county of Rantzau, the wealthiest among the wealthy officials of the country. To these two, in conjunction with the justiciar of Reinbeck, was given the name of "the three princes of

Holstein." Doubtless this was a fertile field for the nurture of erudite legal dissertations, for in the matters in dispute it was possible in all good faith to prove, after the manner beloved of all jurists, that two identical things are none the less different. It was natural enough that the Schleswig-Holsteiners should trouble themselves little as to the dubious and involved legal status of this small territory. As regards all essentials they were right. A few only of their hotspurs overshot the mark by maintaining that the male line was entitled to inherit in Lauenburg as well. This could not be seriously contended, for Lauenburg had been conveyed to Denmark as compensation for Norway, and incontestably therefore was within the rights of succession of the Danish crown. The Lauenburgers knew this themselves. The even tenour of their feudalist existence had never been troubled by any arbitrary conduct on the part of the Danes, and they cared little when their German neighbours charged them with weakness, for a struggle in which their own territorial rights were not at issue seemed to them a small matter.

The anger of the Schleswig-Holsteiners was the outcome of a feeling that their rights were being infringed; but this anger was accentuated and ennobled by a fine patriotic sentiment, by the proud conviction that the old territorial right was also Germany's cause. The popular movement took no account of dynastic considerations. Nothing could have been more untrue than the accusation, continually repeated in the Copenhagen press, that the house of Augustenburg had fomented the disorders in the duchies. In the year 1786, when the future of the royal house seemed endangered, the younger Bernstorff had brought about a marriage between Frederick Christian Duke of Augustenburg (Schiller's patron) and a daughter of Christian VII. The sagacious statesman hoped that thereby the two lines would be united, and that the risk of any dispute about the succession would consequently be averted. The anxieties which had then been pressing disappeared when shortly afterwards an heir to the throne was born, who subsequently reigned as Christian VIII. Since that time, however, the Augustenburgs had been regarded as secret pretenders by the Copenhagen court, and had suffered much from the hostility of the crown. They kept a close and suspicious watch upon their rights, protesting when Holstein seceded from the union of the Holy Empire—an instance of

dynastic foresight which was subsequently praised beyond its merits.[1] They even had serious thoughts of asserting their hereditary claims upon Oldenburg when Napoleon discrowned the princely house that ruled over that territory.[2] From the above mentioned Danish marriage had sprung the reigning duke Christian Augustus, and his brother, the prince of Noer. Sons of a Danish woman, grandsons of an English woman, they had both passed part of their youth abroad, and had fully adopted that sanspatrie outlook which has clouded the wits of so many of the members of the great European confraternity of princes. Germany always remained to them a matter of indifference, and they regarded the liberal trend of the day with horror. They cared for one thing and one thing only—the rights of their house. For this reason they always remained suspect to their Danish relatives, although Christian VIII, in marrying their sister, had been guided purely by affection, whilst the kind-hearted queen, Caroline Amelia, invariably did her best to mediate between the brothers-in-law. In private letters the prince of Noer wrote in the coarsest way concerning "that idiot my brother-in-law and his baggage of a wife, who may go to hell for all I care."

The duke was a man of culture, and his guests at Gravenstein and Augustenburg were apt to praise him for his kindly hospitality, but the restrained demeanour of the man of the world concealed an arrogant self-opinionatedness, and in the course of the prolonged isolation of his retired rural life this trait became so exaggerated that in the end he regarded every opinion differing from his own as "utter nonsense." His conduct at the Schleswig diet was tactful and intelligent, but he never inspired either confidence or affection. His serfs in Sundewitt and on the isle of Alsen cordially detested the harsh landlord, and were the most zealous among the Danish party in all northern Schleswig. Like his royal brother-in-law, he had no faith in the moral powers of the folk life. To his arid understanding chance seemed the motive force of history.

Equally self-satisfied was the prince of Noer, who made a provocative display of his overweening pride. He had a good word for no one, not even for his brother, and he

[1] See Appendix XXXVII.

[2] Frederick Christian Duke of Augustenburg to D. H. Hegewisch the historian, December 24, 1811.

affronted all with whom he came in contact by his offensive junkerish manners. Even after the war he boasted that he had been "the only consistent person throughout the Schleswig-Holstein affair." [1] Though quite without military capacity, he plumed himself upon his warrior talents, looking down compassionately upon the Prussian army as if from a vantage ground of celestial superiority. He had no lack of restless ambition. For years he endeavoured to secure the governor generalship for his house, though subsequently he could not but realise that the office was brilliant rather than influential. Apart from a few personal friends, the Augustenburgs had no adherents. Carl Samwer, even, was quite unknown to the duke when he published his first writing upon the question of the succession; [2] he had been moved solely by honest juristic conviction, and only at a later date did he enter into relationships with the Augustenburg court. From the close of the thirties onwards the duke had composed a number of unsigned pamphlets and newspaper articles in defence of his rights, and numerous other pens were at his disposal. But all this busy authorship could effect little. At that date the name of Augustenburg had a repellent rather than an attractive sound for the great mass of simple burghers and peasants. Troubling themselves little about the rival dynasties, they reserved their enthusiasm for their country's ancient German rights.

Quite recently, in the summer of 1844, King Christian, following his usual custom, had passed some time upon the island of Föhr, and on his way thither the cordial reception which the Schleswig-Holsteiners everywhere gave him sufficed to show how little inclined were these loyal subjects lightheartedly to renounce allegiance to their duke. But now Allgreen Ussing's proposal raised a ferment. The Itzehoe diet had just met. Count Friedrich Reventlow, Lord Abbot of the nobles' monastery of Preetz, was the leading figure. A highly cultured aristocrat of the good old Holstein sort, a conservative by training and inclination, he was none the less open-minded enough to recognise the just claims of the growing liberal bourgeoisie. He had a stately presence, was at once proud and gentle, and had an intense respect for

[1] Prince of Noer to Franz Hegewisch, December 25, 1853.

[2] This is made clear by the duke of Augustenburg's letters to Franz Hegewisch, under dates March 14 and April 3, 1844.

established right. Upon his motion, the diet voted a declaration of rights, formally embodying the three main principles of Schleswig-Holstein constitutional law, namely, the independence of the duchies, their indivisibility, and the right of succession of the male line. The estates indignantly denounced the terrorist pretensions of the Zealand diet, which, quite exceeding its competence, had passed resolutions concerning the right of succession in the duchies, while desiring to forbid the Germans to say a word about the matter. A warning reference was made to Spain, where a light-hearted change in the order of succession had led to civil war. Since the Schleswig diet had not yet met, the Ritterschaft of the two duchies assembled under the presidency of Count Reventlow-Preetz, and drafted a finely worded address to the monarch, petitioning for the maintenance of the territorial rights. All was fruitless. Twice during these years did the king endeavour to persuade his brother-in-law to a voluntary renunciation. The duke's answer was that such a renunciation could be expected from the female line alone. He went no further, for he did not wish to abandon the standing ground of chartered rights, and he doubtless felt, moreover, in view of the hatred felt for him by the Danes, that it would be inexpedient for him to give open expression to his hopes for the kingly crown.

Encouraged by the proposal of the Rotschild diet, Christian now ventured a further step, and summoned a commission to discuss the Schleswig-Holstein succession. There were three German members: Pechlin, federal envoy, an ultraconservative; from the foreign office, Minister Heinrich Reventlow-Criminil and Councillor Dankwart; the fourth member of the commission was Cabinet Secretary Adler. Not one of the four was expert in constitutional law. After lengthy deliberations they issued a report which did not contain a single valid conclusion. Whilst affirming that the female line had the right of succession in a part of the duchies, they advised against a public declaration to this effect until negotiations should have taken place with the agnates and the great powers. But the king wished to push matters forward, and he expressed his desires to the council of state in a fiery address. Next, on July 8, 1846, "to counteract hazy and erroneous views," he announced in an open letter that on the strength of the commission's report he was determined to maintain the hereditary right of his royal successor in Schleswig; as regarded certain parts

of Holstein, this hereditary right was dubious, but he hoped to overcome all difficulties and "to bring about the complete recognition of the integrity of the Danish united state"; for the rest, the rights of the duchies were to remain intact. The report of the commission was never published in its entirety, for its tenour was even vaguer than that of the open letter. Such parts as were made public could easily be refuted. The commission referred chiefly to the fact that when the Gottorp portion of Schleswig was united with the royal portion in the year 1721, the knights and officials had taken oath to King Frederick IV "to be leal true, and serviceable to the king and his hereditary successors in the government *secundum tenorem legis regiæ*."[1] It was obvious, however, that this "customary oath of allegiance," ambiguously worded, sworn once only in Gottorp-Schleswig and never in royal Schleswig, could have had no bearing on the succession rights in the territory without the assent of the agnates and the diets.

The open letter was in conformity with King Christian's character. It was the outcome of unduly elaborate calculation, and therefore of an unwise inclination for half-measures. It aimed at giving the Schleswig-Holsteiners a friendly confidence in their king-duke's paternal intentions. Yet at the same time it violated the right of Schleswig, and threatened to violate the right of Holstein, thus arousing almost as much excitement as if it had been an actual coup d'état. The Danes had hitherto cared little for the talented epicurean, but now the king suddenly became popular. He thanked the Rotschild diet for its patriotism, adding a gentle censure upon the body for having manifestly exceeded its powers. Among the Germans, on the other hand, indignation was widespread. The prince of Noer, the governor-general, resigned his post; Count Joseph Reventlow, president of the German chancellery, Reventlow-Altenhof the envoy, and several more high officials, followed suit; the duke of Glücksburg threw up his commission. Carl Moltke, an able, rigid absolutist who conceived it to be his only duty to carry out the monarch's will, succeeded Joseph Reventlow as head of the German chancellery. The governor-generalship remained vacant, and henceforward therefore uncontrolled power was in the hands of Scheel, the new president of the Schleswig-Holstein territorial government, a vulgar arrivist who would lend himself to anything and who

[1] See vol. IV, p. 426.

alienated the Germans by his detestable manners. In July, the Holstein diet was informed that the recent motion had greatly displeased the king. Thereupon the diet, acting upon the suggestion of Count Reventlow-Preetz, voted a sharply worded address. When Scheel refused to receive this, the diet, desiring to safeguard territorial rights, lodged a protest with the Germanic Federation. Scheel's next step was to forbid any further representations on the subject, and all the deputies, with six exceptions, promptly resigned. The substitutes were summoned, but this availed nothing, and the diet was dissolved.

The Schleswig diet met in October, and here the whole movement centred round the president, Wilhelm Beseler, as in Itzehoe it had centred round Reventlow-Preetz. As invariably happens when the people is deeply stirred, born leaders promptly came to the front. Beseler was a barrister, a man of dignified demeanour, exemplary life, and full of self-confidence. Tenacious in character, he was like Reventlow a moderate in his political views, but inclined rather to the bourgeois liberal outlook. More than one hundred addresses were sent from the duchy to its diet. Most of them were personally presented, and almost all of them voiced strong opposition to the open letter. The deliberations were stormy, Tiedemann the sloop-owner and Gülich the jurist making a frank attack upon the whole system of government. The duke of Augustenburg then moved an address begging the king to grant a joint constitution to Schleswig-Holstein. Thus when the right moment came the duke withdrew his opposition to liberal ideas, recognising that after all that had happened the independence of the duchies could no longer be maintained under advisory provincial diets. The address was adopted, all the members voting for it with two exceptions. Scheel insisted that the royal proposals must be discussed before any others, his obvious intention being to deprive the estates of their constitutional right of petition by suddenly closing the diet. Since he would not give way, the duke, entering a formal protest, left the hall, followed by the great majority of the assembly. The diet was dissolved, the old constitution of provincial estates having spontaneously broken down. The territory was deprived of representation, and the Ritterschaft therefore, at Reventlow's instigation, sent a further protest to the king.

Christian meanwhile had set out upon his customary summer tour through the duchies, but he found a transformed

people. An icy chill prevailed everywhere; hardly anyone but officials attended his receptions; when he reviewed the troops, the civilian spectators, thronging round him, sang "Schleswig-Holstein, sea-encircled!" This wounded him deeply. On September 18th, his birthday, he issued a second open letter wherein he assured the Germans in kindly patriarchal fashion that the independence of Holstein was not threatened in any way whatever, but was safeguarded by the indivisibility of the monarchy. What good could these empty words do, seeing that they contained no retractation? Count Reventlow-Preetz was refused audience when he visited the château of Plön hoping to open the monarch's eyes, for Christian would have nothing more to do with the refractory estates of Holstein. The popular movement therefore continued. In July already, at Neumünster, a great public meeting adopted a resolution proposed by Lorentzen to the effect that the country must cling firmly to the three essential elements of its ancient rights, and must in case of need effect a union with Germany. When Theodor Olshausen attempted to hold a great public demonstration at Nortorf, he was arrested and sent to Rendsburg, and the Nortorf meeting quietly dispersed under threat of armed intervention. Olshausen, however, was speedily set at liberty, and secured a triumphal reception from the men of Kiel.

Immediately before the appearance of the open letter, the duke of Augustenburg had presented his sons at the Copenhagen court. His reception had been most friendly, the king graciously bestowing colonelcies upon the young princes, though this annoyed the Danes, whilst the queen, being of German birth, was subjected to ill-natured comment.[1] Yet at this very time Christian was secretly preparing to infringe the rights of his agnates. When the unexpected coup had taken place, the duke at once lodged a protest, and sent a statement of grievances to the Bundestag. All the princes of the Augustenburg and the Glücksburg lines supported him, with one exception, Christian, Prince of Glücksburg, who adopted the king's side, having recently married a daughter of Landgravine Charlotte, and therefore building on the future of the Hessian line. The grand duke of Oldenburg likewise gave formal notice of his hereditary claims.

Kiel university, too, rushed once more into the fray.

[1] Schoultz von Ascheraden's Report, June 28, 1846.

Whereas in Copenhagen not a single professor had for a considerable period ventured a word in favour of the duchies, among the professors of Kiel there were two fanatical adherents of the Danish party, Flor and Paulsen. On the whole, however, the German outlook preponderated at Kiel. Even Dahlmann, who, being a scrupulous man, would have preferred to defer a decision upon this difficult problem of the succession until he had had time to examine it more closely, felt constrained to admit that the open letter menaced the indivisibility of the territory and therewith the entire constitution, and he therefore openly took the side of his fellow countrymen. His views were shared by the young historians Waitz and Droysen; and indeed among the Kiel professors it became a point of honour to advocate German rights in the north. Nine of them, led by the veteran Falck, published an incisive and in most respects convincing refutation of the commission's report, and the king felt so uncertain of his ground that he ventured nothing more than a gentle reprimand. Samwer's keen pen was once more at work, Dirckinck-Holmfeld, Wegener the historiographer, and the other Danish publicists, were speedily driven into a corner. They could not fail to see how trifling was the import of the oath of fealty sworn in the years 1721, and they sought other expedients. These alleged democrats burrowed like moles among the musty feudalist claims of the Sonderburg line. They even wished to dispute the royal rank of the young Augustenburg princes, on the ground that the duke and his brother had married beneath them when they wedded the countesses Danneskjold. Yet everyone knew that a question of misalliance must be decided in accordance with the domestic laws and family customs of the dynasty concerned, and that in the house of Holstein-Oldenburg marriages with women of the lesser nobility had been extremely common. No one in Schleswig-Holstein would permit his mind to be confused by such artifices. The territory held together like a single great family which is fighting for its rights, all classes making common cause with unwonted cordiality. Whereas German neighbours had in earlier days been inclined to make good-humoured fun of the strutting gait of the Holsteiners, they now rejoiced one and all in the splendid unanimity of the northern march.

Upon public opinion throughout Germany the effect of the open letter was no less stimulating than had six years earlier been that of the combative clamour of the French.

At that time, however, the nation had proudly confronted a well-matched foe. Now the Germans were shame-stricken, for an insignificant neighbour had trampled German rights underfoot without so much as a word of explanation. Geibel voiced the universal feeling when he sang:

> A very farce, methinks, this sight!
> A small and weakly island realm
> Like crested dragon rearing helm
> And fiercely challenging to fight!

The storm found vent in numberless pamphlets and poems, meetings and speeches. The Heidelberg professors led the way, sending to Wilhelm Beseler in July an address composed by Gervinus, wherein it was declared: "Self-neglect is the greatest of political and national sins." Since this grave struggle for power took the form, for the nonce, of a disputed problem in constitutional law and history, professors were for a time again to the forefront in German life. Hälschner of Bonn and many other historians and jurists discussed the problem of the succession in erudite polemic writings. Helwing of Berlin went so far as to advance the well-meaning but quite untenable contention that the right of succession in the duchies really belonged to the house of Brandenburg. General Radowitz attracted much attention by a booklet entitled *Who inherits in Schleswig?* His relatives, the Reventlows, had furnished him with detailed information concerning the affairs of Transalbingia. Upon the legal question he unreservedly adopted the outlook of the Schleswig-Holsteiners, showing here for the first time that he possessed a far more elastic intelligence than King Frederick William's other intimates. Among the more distinguished German jurists one only ventured to defend the king of Denmark. This was Minister Kamptz, aforetime persecutor of the demagogues, whose very name might be expected to arouse hostility to any cause he espoused. In his *Observations upon the Open Letter* he displayed abundant learning but much confusion of mind. According to him the Schleswig-Holsteiners were merely rebels, and he declared that the federal act sufficed to show that the Germans had nothing to do with Schleswig. The nation troubled itself little, the Augustenburgs concerned themselves not at all, about legal quibbles and ancient parchments. What stirred the Germans was the feeling of national self-assertion. Geibel again found

the right word, again grasped the lofty significance of the struggle, when he wrote:

> We will not, will not Danes become,
> Germans let us be.

This feeling was manifested so vigorously in the passionate proceedings of the lesser German diets that even the princes could not completely escape it. Indeed, by the Danish coup de main their own sanctum sanctorum, the legitimate right of the dynasties, was no less threatened than was the national honour. Moreover, the Holstein princes were busily making the round of the courts. The estates of the duchies sent Tiedemann and other trusty agents to the petty governments to inform these concerning the territorial rights of the northern march. Strangely enough, the old Guelph sovereign was peculiarly friendly. At the Lüneburg manœuvres of the tenth federal army corps, Ernest Augustus had noticed how the Holstein soldiers, whenever anyone ventured to speak of them as Danes, would angrily exclaim: "We are good Germans!" He had a personal fondness for the Augustenburg duke, and Count Platen, his envoy in Berlin, who had relatives among the Holstein nobility, confirmed the king of Hanover in his sentiments.[1] In view of all these considerations it seemed likely that the statement of grievances would secure a favourable hearing at the Bundestag.

Very different were the views of the great powers, who all adhered to the inviolable article of faith that the integrity of the Danish monarchy was essential to the preservation of the European balance of power. Harmless folk might well ask in amazement why the European balance of power would be hopelessly upset if the population of the petty state on the Sound and the Belt were to fall from three and a half to one and a half millions But persons with more insight could not fail to recognise that there were serious reasons underlying the opinion of the great courts. This opinion was not merely the outcome of the love of peace characteristic of the age; it was rooted in the general dread of an increase in the strength of Germany. No one doubted that Schleswig-Holstein, if detached from Denmark, would adhere firmly to Germany; would safeguard itself by summoning Prussian troops; would

[1] Platen's Reports, July 6, 1847, and subsequent dates.

perhaps open to the Prussian navy, whose first vessel had just been launched, the finest harbour in the Baltic. A German naval port in Kiel! Was not this an idea to cause perturbation in every English breast? Through hatred for Germany, Denmark's hereditary enemies the British now became patrons and well-wishers of the Copenhagen court. Immediately after the appearance of the open letter, the *Times*, which at that date was still a powerful organ of national opinion, wrote: "Prussian statesmen cannot be acquitted of the charge of having displayed a certain alacrity in fostering a febrile excitement perilous to the tranquillity of a neighbouring country. They have done this, partly to amuse the German nation, and partly perhaps to divert attention from other aims, aims that are far more practical and touch Prussian interests far more closely." The writer proceeded to warn Germany against land-hunger, which was dangerous enough in the new world, but was positively disastrous in Europe. Such was the hypocrisy displayed by a nation which acquired new colonies every year, and ventured to scold the Germans for their modest desire to retain the heritage of their forefathers! The Prussian government continued to hold aloof, for its only desire as yet was that the integrity of the Danish united state should be preserved, it mattered not under which dynasty—for, strangely enough, Denmark was regarded as a bulwark against Russia!

France, Denmark's long-standing and loyal ally, took a somewhat bolder line. The relationship between the two courts was extremely cordial. On one occasion Louis Philippe had sent to Copenhagen as envoy extraordinary no less a man than Decazes of Bourbon fame, but now half forgotten, who happened to be a Danish vassal as well as a French citizen. The king of Denmark was greatly flattered, and appointed Guizot as the first bourgeois knight of his order of the elephant. At this juncture the French envoy Baron Billing was making a number of mysterious journeys to and fro between Copenhagen, Paris, and London, to promote King Christian's plans. Realising that he must pass from observation to action, he secured instructions from Guizot to counteract the endeavours of Prussia and Russia, although the two Baltic naval powers had not in fact any common aims on the Sound.[1] For the

[1] Schoultz von Ascheraden's Reports, January 16, May 25 and 30, and June 25, 1846.

time being, these petty diplomatic intrigues bore no fruit. The court of the Tuileries regarded the Danish united state as one of the sanctuaries of Europe, but the French government had troubles enough of its own, and had not formed definite views upon the question of the succession.

The western powers could not demand anything for themselves in Schleswig-Holstein. The court of St. Petersburg, on the other hand, showed plainly enough that it was far from disinclined to favour a partition of the German duchies. It was true that many years before, by the treaties of 1767 and 1773, the Russian Gottorps had formally renounced all claim to the long lost Schleswig, and had exchanged their share in Holstein for the counties of Delmenhorst and Oldenburg, which were subsequently assigned to the youngest of the Gottorp lines. But what Russian treaty was ever signed which did not subsequently prove to have a flaw in it somewhere? The renunciation was effected in favour of the then king of Denmark and "his successors on the throne." It had now become open to dispute who these successors on the throne were. Consequently (such was the peculiar logic of the Muscovites) Russia's claim to the Gottorp share of Holstein might perhaps be revived, and by good fortune Kiel harbour was part of this share. Nesselrode repeatedly declared to the Prussian envoy: "We consider that we have claims upon Holstein. I have counselled the czar against relinquishing these claims, for it would not be proper that he should sacrifice the rights of his successors, and he certainly ought to secure something in compensation." [1] The Russian chancellor spoke yet more plainly in an instruction to the chargé d'affaires in Copenhagen. He praised the open letter as a wise measure, and thoroughly approved the Danish monarch's legal outlook. Since the house of Gottorp had renounced the right of succession to the Danish throne, there would be no doubt, he wrote confidently, that Schleswig lay within the sphere of that right—although it was obvious that the Gottorps could not cede to another a right which they themselves had never possessed. It is true that further negotiations were requisite as far as Holstein was concerned, but the czar would be honestly pleased to bring the claims of the house of Gottorp into harmony "with the vital interests of a monarchy whose maintenance and indivisibility are matters of just concern to the king of

[1] Rochow's Reports, August 6, 19, and 27, September 25, 1846.

Denmark, a concern which his imperial majesty shares in the highest degree." [1] Christian, therefore, could count upon Russia's support if he were willing in case of need to give compensation to the house of Gottorp. For the time being, the czar did not reject the Augustenburg claim, but he looked upon the Schleswig-Holsteiners' conduct as revolutionary.

The Transalbingian dispute came at an extremely inopportune moment for the Hofburg, inasmuch as the Austrian realm, owing to the peculiarities of its structure, had but one thing to dread, the power of nationalist ideas. Metternich would never hear a word of Germanism, Danism, or any other "ism" of the kind. His wrath was aroused by the rabble of the German liberal party and their cries of tally-ho; he considered the whole shameless agitation to be artificial and revolutionary; and above all he would have liked to see the impudent Heidelberg professors soundly punished. But he cast it up against the crown of Denmark that for years it had been encouraging the liberal vermin, and that it had now prematurely disclosed unripe designs, "whereas it is not the custom to take guests into the kitchen, but to lay food before them after it has been dished up." Warned, however, from Berlin he recognised that the intense excitement in Germany must somehow be appeased. Since he especially desired to prevent the disruption of the united state of Denmark (were it only in order to avert the possible strengthening of Prussia), he came to the conclusion that it would be best to repeal the king's law, and to arrange for the succession of the Augustenburgs throughout the crown-lands. No more friendly advice could possibly have been given to the king of Denmark. If only men had not been human beings! If only the savage germanophobia of the Danes had not blocked this route, the safest of all!

Strange, almost tragi-comical, was the demeanour of the Berlinese court at this juncture. All foreigners believed that Prussia was animated by ambitions positively enforced upon the country by its history, and yet any such designs were utterly alien to the gentle disposition of the king. Frederick William had never even debated the question whether the Transalbingian disputes might not be turned to account for the benefit of Prussia's position on the Baltic, and he considered

[1] Nesselrode, Instruction to Ewers, chargé d'affaires in Copenhagen, August 3-15, 1846.

it quite inconceivable that anyone could imagine him to entertain such preposterous schemes. Just as the tolerably satisfactory issue to the Cologne episcopal dispute had been solely due to the stubbornness of Droste-Vischering, in like manner the inevitable struggles, as the outcome of which our northern march was ultimately to be brought beneath the sway of the Hohenzollern sceptre, were not produced by Prussian foresight, but were solely due to the stupidity of Christian VIII and his Danes. A government devoid of pride and vigour, one with which it is a matter of principle that the sword must never be drawn, may be able for a time, through the might of tradition, to continue to preserve an efficient army, but the speedy demoralisation of its foreign office is inevitable. How lamentable a spectacle was presented by the diplomatic corps under the fourth Frederick William in contrast with those bold and warlike envoys who had with such stoutness fulfilled the commands of the great king. General Rauch was a good Russian, although he had not completely lost his Prussian sentiments; Bunsen was a good Englishman; Count Arnim was a good Austrian. Worse than all the rest, however, was Baron Schoultz von Ascheraden, envoy in Copenhagen. Denmark had never had among her own nationals a better Danish patriot than this cosmopolitan Prussian envoy. Schoultz had for many years been in charge of the Copenhagen embassy, in general a post of no importance, so that all the courts were wont to send their diplomatic nullities to Denmark. As ill luck would have it, he still held the office when it suddenly became one of prime importance. He felt thoroughly at home on the Sound; he believed every word said to him by the Danish ministers, almost all of whom were cultured and amiable persons; and he was accustomed to report most conscientiously, in his abominable French (anent which the king could not refrain from making at times sarcastic marginal notes), what the court was thinking of doing during the greater part of the summer—"pendant la pluralité de l'été."[1] At the outset of the Schleswig-Holstein troubles he waxed indignant at the insubordination of the Germans. He was no less outraged than his Danish friends at the insatiable greed, the cunning, the studied aloofness of the Augustenburg "pretender."[2] Though he now and again

[1] Schoultz von Ascheraden's Report, April 10, 1847.
[2] Schoultz von Ascheraden's Report, December 11, 1846.

complained bitterly of Danish animosity, he did not in the least realise the true significance of the national struggle.

King Frederick William's good sense was not to be misled by the ludicrous reports emanating from his envoy. He was grieved by the hatred which had grown up between German and Dane, for it seemed to him, as Canitz said, "one of the most tiresome stupidities of our enlightened age"; [1] he honestly desired that the united state should endure, and he wished to avoid anything which might irritate the royal friend who had quite recently, in Copenhagen, shown him so much affection. But justice was sacred to him. Already in the year 1845 he had commissioned two jurists, Eichhorn and Lancizolle, to write an expert opinion upon the question of the Danish succession, and though the conclusions of this memorial were very ambiguous, he had no doubt in his own mind as to the better right of the Augustenburgs. Like Metternich, he hoped that the dispute would be settled by the Hessian line renouncing its claim and by the succession of the agnates to the throne of the united state. Then might the reconciled Danes abide until the end of all time in Kiel and Altona under the sceptre of Augustenburg kings. Similarity of views was, it is true, not perfect, for the Viennese court regarded the integrity of Denmark as the essential thing, whereas the Berlinese court considered the rights of the duchies and of the agnates as of more importance. In the last resort, as was conjectured in the above-mentioned expert opinion, Prussia would recognise a sovereign Schleswig-Holstein ruled by a German princely house. Canitz maintained that it was the Danish estates, not those of Holstein, which had started the dispute. "The Danes are revolutionaries and are filled with an absurd hatred for Germany. They prostitute the idea of nationality in order to disturb the political peace from above, just as the Poles have tried to do from below. We certainly desire the integrity of the Danish realm, but not to the detriment of German rights." [2]

The first requisite was that the Bundestag should give an answer to the Holstein grievances. At the outset Metternich had held that the affair did not concern the Federation, but he yielded to Canitz' insistence, and agreed that a federal decree was more likely to safeguard the rights of Germany and

[1] Canitz to Rochow, November 9, 1845.
[2] Canitz to Rochow, October 2 and 21, 1847.

at the same time to make a sharp attack upon the rabble rout of liberals. The trusty Münch, who was entirely sympathetic with the Danes, was therefore called upon, as Canitz mockingly said, "to step outside the magic circle of declarations of incompetency," and to despatch the affair with a speed hitherto unknown in Frankfort.[1] It could not be otherwise. The diets, the press, innumerable petitions of every sort, poured in upon the Bundestag. As "a serious sign of the times" the Prussian federal envoy instanced the appeal of an enthusiastic Berlinese student who was later to earn considerable fame. This young man advised the Bundestag to send a federal commissary forthwith to Copenhagen, and he proceeded to excuse his boldness by appealing to "the example of the Maid of Orleans, who, though but a simple shepherdess, saved her fatherland."[2]

Baron von Pechlin, the Danish plenipotentiary, who was a German at heart and had accepted the open letter with great reluctance, made the following conciliatory declaration: "I can truthfully avow that my king never had it in mind to infringe the rights of the Germanic Federation. I may even affirm that the two duchies share every privilege, even to the provincial diets and some other institutions." Since the open letter proclaimed nothing, but merely the reflected personal views of the king, the Bundestag, on September 17th, expressed the confident hope that the king would take into account when settling this matter "the rights of all and sundry, and in especial the rights of the Federation, the agnates, and the Holstein estates." At the same time, the governments were desired "to keep within bounds the passionate outbursts of meritorious patriotic feeling." Everyone, including Pechlin, agreed to this proposal. Electoral Hesse, however, wished to have a sharper reprimand administered to the German patriots; while the Luxemburg envoy pleaded that he had no instructions, plainly fearing lest Luxemburg's turn should come next. Spiritless as the decision appeared, it was not altogether without value. Despite its usual practice, the Bundestag had not this time declared itself "incompetent" to take action; on the contrary, it had definitely upheld its prerogatives, and won for the first time a word of praise from the moderate parties.

[1] Canitz to Rochow, September 7; Dönhoff's Reports, Frankfort, August 22, September 2, 1846.

[2] Dönhoff's Report, September 17, 1846.

Christian was now aware that he would achieve nothing if he clung to the policy outlined in the open letter; he felt very unhappy and could not hide his feelings even from Schoultz-Ascheraden.[1] The king, speaking to Wrangel the Prussian general, uttered bitter complaints. How could the Germans so misconstrue his intentions? Never had he dreamed of wrenching Schleswig-Holstein from Germany! In June, 1847, he sent an old friend to Berlin to take counsel concerning the question of the succession. This was Count Löwenstern, who felt unable to refuse this knightly service to his king. Canitz maintained that the only way to preserve the united state was to repeal the king's law and to instal the Augustenburgs on the throne. This solution the old Dane could not accept. The Viennese court, obviously by prearrangement, gave an identical answer.[2] Now King Christian bethought him of another and stranger way of gaining his ends. He wished to provide his united state with a parliament modelled upon the Prussian united diet, whose deliberations he was following with tense eagerness. Subsequently, with the aid of a staunch Danish majority in this national assembly, he hoped to bring about the recognition of the female line as the rightful heirs to the throne. Into what a maze had the monarch been led through his over-astuteness! After all that had happened, the question of the succession was now to be settled before the question of the constitution; for so long as it had not been decided whether the united state was to persist or not, it would be difficult for the Schleswig-Holsteiners to agree to a constitution that should apply to the united state as a whole. During the next few months Christian had his plans for a constitution worked out by Carl Moltke and the indispensable Adler. Suddenly, however, on January 20, 1848, the king died after a short illness. He was the cleverest of a long, monotonous line of Oldenburg monarchs; but he was a man of ill-omen, a ruler who destroyed the power of his house because he disregarded the rights of his peoples.

The tidings of the king's death shook the country to its very depths. The Danes had everything to hope, the Germans everything to fear, from Christian's successor. In all probability Frederick VII was to be the last ruler of his line, for he

[1] Schoultz von Ascheraden's Report, November 4, 1846.

[2] Reports: from Count Platen, Berlin, June 11; from Count Arnim, Vienna, June 14, 1847.

had a love relationship with a milliner, Louise Rasmussen by name, and this woman had him so securely in her toils that the prospect of a third royal marriage seemed remote. He passed his days in puerile, senseless amusements, and was only happy with low companions who dared not murmur when it pleased the king suddenly to play the despot. Rough, uncultured, coarse-fibred, violent-tempered, not devoid of understanding and a rude kind of humour, he never learned to work seriously. Dane to the core, he hated all foreigners. He greatly preferred the loose merry-making of the sailors who held their jollifications in the C 4's saloon and in other pothouses on the Copenhagen Knuppels-bro, to the more sober ways of the Schleswig-Holsteiners. He was not averse to liberal ideas, although he hardly possessed any political principles. He had inherited nothing from his father save faint-heartedness and an easy-going, unwarriorlike disposition. A clumsy fellow, he became sprightly and manly only when on board ship; he could be moved to a show of enthusiasm solely by stories of the northern vikings, or by Johannes Ewald's ballad, "King Christian stood by the lofty mast."

During his last illness the old king had in the course of a lengthy epistle set forth his advice in regard to the new government. At first Christian's successor acted the good son; following his father's wish he called Count Carl Moltke to the ministry of state and announced in a manifesto his intention to "bring to an issue the proposals anent public relationships" which his predecessor had had in mind. The amnesty granted to political prisoners sounded like mockery in the ears of the Schleswig-Holsteiners, for in the duchies not one of the innumerable trials had led to a conviction. On January 28th a patent summoned to the capital fifty-two men of experience, twenty-six from the kingdom and twenty-six from the duchies, to give an opinion concerning the united state constitution elaborated by the late monarch. Sixteen of these experts were to be nominated by the king, the remainder were to be selected by the respective territories. The phrasing of the patent was cunningly conceived. It spoke of "Our kingdom of Denmark and our duchies of Schleswig and Holstein"; this conveying the impression that the constitutional bond between the two German lands was tacitly recognised. The plans for a constitution had a very close resemblance to those of Prussia; the provincial diets were to continue to

function, but over them was to be placed a united state parliament which was to meet alternately in the kingdom and in the duchies, and was to legislate for the whole area and to vote new taxes. This was the last masterpiece of the crafty old king. The apparent equality of the two unequal halves of the united state was to tickle the fancy of the Germans. At one and the same time the king might hope to keep in leash, with the aid of his sixteen trusted liegemen, the ambitions of the radical Eiderdanes and the desires of the Schleswig-Holsteiners. Success, at least temporary, might have crowned these plans had the king survived. But what was to be expected under the rule of a monarch who could command neither the respect of the Danes nor the confidence of the Germans ?

Immediately after Christian's death, the Copenhagen democracy manifested an extremely unruly demeanour. A writing by professors Clausen and Schouw, violent, nay menacing, in tone, proclaimed the programme of the Eiderdanes: the Danification of Schleswig, and the severance of Holstein. A meeting of municipal councillors, summoned by Hvidt, councillor of state and an elderly hotspur, sent a deputation to the new ruler to demand an immediate change in the constitution. King Frederick would not receive these emissaries, but he promptly summoned to the ministry his friend Bardenfleth, a fanatical Danist. The Eiderdanes felt that the wind was setting in their favour, and blusteringly demanded that the men of experience should be chosen proportionally to population, in the ratio that is to say of five Danes to three Germans. To the last moment, however, the Schleswig-Holsteiners endeavoured to confine their activities within the limits of moderation, and would not reject the new king-duke's proffered hand. At a gathering in Kiel, attended by all the diet deputies of the two duchies, Reventlow and Beseler spoke with much restraint, and on February 17th it was agreed that the election of the men of experience should be undertaken, but that a pledge should be exacted from every candidate that he would conscientiously uphold German rights. Few continued to believe that a peaceful solution was still possible. Already in the previous autumn Reventlow and Beseler had considered the possibility of an open struggle. The very summoning of this assembly, which could not be regarded as anything else than a united diet of Schleswig-Holstein, showed

plainly enough that the old united state of Denmark was breaking up. The Augustenburgs were beginning to burn their boats. At Christian's obsequies, a stately ceremony, not one of the line was present, and when the new sovereign (departing from the family custom of recent decades) demanded the renewal of their oath of allegiance, both the duke of Augustenburg and the prince of Noer refused. To King Frederick all this seemed deliberate rebellion.[1]

The situation was extremely strained. At any moment national passions were likely to surge up on one side or the other, thus beginning the sanguinary struggle for Germany's northern march. The king of Prussia perceived this plainly. Shortly after the opening of the new reign he sent his confidant General Gerlach to Copenhagen, ostensibly to convey a message of sympathy, but in reality to observe and if need be to advise. Canitz had the general thoroughly enlightened regarding Danish affairs by Hans von Bülow, the able councillor to legation, and on February 4th he furnished Gerlach with detailed instructions which, whilst affording a fresh proof of the innocent straightforwardness of the Prussian government, showed also how incompetent was that government to understand the seriousness of the time and the intensity of the national oppositions. Canitz continued to regard the dispute between the Danes and the Germans as mere foolishness. He looked upon Denmark as Germany's natural ally, seeing that the Danish fleet had no occasion to dread a German rival. Since he did not desire that this ally should be weakened, he was opposed to the policy of the Eiderdanes, who were seeking their own profit in a spirit of purblind germanophobia, and he was equally opposed to the design of conquering Schleswig for Germany, "a plan springing," he said, "from an unsound or at best nebulous view of the concept of nationality." Now, as heretofore, he desired to maintain the integrity of the Danish monarchy, preferably under the sway of the Augustenburgs. But he clung to the traditional rights of the duchies, saying: "We must lead the way; this is one of those exceptional matters in which we can count upon the approval of the federated German governments."[2]

Delayed by adverse weather, Gerlach did not reach the Danish capital until February 15th. On his way thither he had

[1] Schoultz von Ascheraden's Reports, February 19 and 28, 1848.
[2] Canitz, Instruction to Gerlach, February 4, 1848.

had interviews with Falck, Reventlow, and other German patriots, being pleasantly surprised to find that these Schleswig-Holsteiners were men of conservative views, despite their associations with the German "agitators." These harmless conversations, wherein he confined himself strictly to the role of the perspicacious onlooker, were none the less regarded by the Danes as treasonable intrigues. On reaching Copenhagen it was at once obvious to him that disorganisation was complete. He saw that Frederick VII was a complete nonentity; he became aware of the dissensions among the king's councillors; he recognised the weakness of Heinrich Reventlow, the only minister animated with German sentiments. It was evident to him that the effective reform of the constitution would be impossible so long as the question of the succession remained open. It was even clear to him that neither the Danes nor the Germans had faith any longer in the integrity of the old united state. But clear-sighted as he was in respect of all these details, he looked upon a bold national policy as a fantasy of the "germanomaniacs," and the possibility of an expansion of Prussia's power never entered his mind. The utmost he had to advise was that Prussia should promptly come to an understanding with Russia and Austria, so that the question of the succession in Denmark might then be peacefully settled, as the question of the succession in Baden had formerly been settled, by the general consent of Europe. When Count Reventlow-Preetz definitely enquired whether the Germanic Federation would protect the Holsteiners should Denmark venture to force a constitution upon Holstein or to detach Schleswig from Holstein, the general answered evasively that Schleswig after all did not belong to the Federation, and he justified himself to Frederick William in the following terms: "Since the bearings of the matter are not perfectly clear to me, I do not consider that it would become me to avail myself of my authority as your majesty's envoy to strengthen the opposition in the duchies." [1] Prussia might well say like Œdipus, "But as it was, all unknowing went I whither I went!" Yet at this very time all the journals of western Europe were railing at "la politique envahissante de l'Allemagne." King Frederick William, whose public utterances should surely have sufficed to make his

[1] Gerlach's Reports to the king, February 16, 19, and 28, and March 1; Gerlach's Report to Canitz, February 24, 1848.

disposition known, was appraised by Lamartine as a formidable being, "one able to understand all, to attempt all, to hazard all!"

The Prussian envoy had spent a fortnight on the Sound, and was intending to prolong his visit, when on March 2nd tidings came that the July monarchy had fallen. Gerlach was compelled to return to Prussia forthwith, and hardly had he quitted the island when the Parisian revolution secured a cataclysmic response in Copenhagen. A violent popular movement threw the plans for a united state upon the scrap-heap. The party of the Eiderdanes gained control, and forced King Frederick into violent courses which were probably accordant with his own secret inclinations. With a single stroke of the pen the unity of Schleswig-Holstein, dating from four centuries back, was annihilated. The die was cast. In face of the unabashed radicalism of war, half-measures were no longer possible. Our northern march was confronted with the question, Danish or German?

CHAPTER VIII.

THE UNITED DIET.

§ 1. THE CONSTITUTIONALIST MOVEMENT. THE PATENT.

In spite of numerous disillusionments and reverses, King Frederick William continued to face life with serene unconcern. Artist by temperament, and possessed of a sense of humour, when his first outburst of anger at any annoyance was over, he was able to dismiss the matter from his mind with a jest, good or bad as the case might be. Though at times he might surrender to a mood of self-criticism, he never failed to return to the belief that in virtue of the divine consecration of his crown he had a better understanding than any other mortal of the course of affairs in the world. Thus obsessed with the conviction of his royal infallibility, he passed his days in cloudland. How lonely, too, had he become within the brief space of five years. Few now believed in his statesmanlike wisdom, and at every step he encountered invincible mistrust. Eichhorn and Bodelschwingh had to waste their fine energies in a fruitless struggle with a public opinion which, despite all its follies, was none the less a living force.

One only among the ministers, General Boyen, enjoyed popular favour. According to the current legend, the organiser of the Landwehr had been martyrised for fidelity to his liberal convictions. His excellent Landwehr song, *Right, Light and Sword*, had given cordial satisfaction to the king, but was turned to account by the malcontents as a means for throwing contempt upon the government. On the occasion of a municipal festival in Berlin, Eichhorn was proposing a toast and was speaking of religious affairs, when noisy interruptions occurred, the audience demanding that Boyen's national anthem should be played, and amid derisory clamour singing to the minister the verses :

> Your civic duties well perform,
> Your creed is then of no concern !

Such incidents wounded the old hero sorely, for he had ever stood high above the parties. The more distressing his realisation that his own rationalistic piety diverged widely from the king's religious romanticism, the more earnestly did he cherish his strictly monarchical sentiments. From time to time a few sparks from the forge of radicalism would fly into the army. Lieutenant Anneke, Lieutenant Willich, and other young officers had to be dismissed the service because they shamelessly disseminated republican or even communistic doctrines. They were enthusiastically championed in the press, and several of them turned up later upon the barricades. During the enquiries into such cases, Boyen was absolutely inexorable, greatly to the astonishment of his liberal admirers. He knew the vital importance of loyalty in the army.

Apart from the providing of a new uniform, which was mainly the king's own work, Boyen in his second term of office secured a further valuable reform in the army. In 1847, as the outcome of experiments and discussions that had been going on for years, the Dreyse needle-gun, a light breech-loading rifle, was definitely adopted as the infantry weapon, its use being gradually made universal. The decision was not an easy one. Boyen, indeed, who liked to do everything in the grand style and was always inclined to contemplate current events in their historic setting, confidently declared that this reform was accordant with the ancient traditions of the Prussian infantry. As long ago, he said, as the days of the Great Elector and the Old Dessauer, the Prussian foot had been distinguished for rapidity of fire. The king, too, prone to enthusiasm, prophesied that the new arm would secure brilliant successes for the fatherland. Many able officers, however, were dubious as to the step. It seemed to them unquestionable that soldiers equipped with firearms that could be discharged with such rapidity would blaze away all their ammunition at the very outset of the battle, and would then be left defenceless. No commander, they said, could fully control his men in such a matter, could master their bloodthirst or their fears. Fortunately this opinion was universally held in other lands. No one was willing to follow the Prussian example, and least of all the lesser German states, for some of these found it more convenient to continue the use of the old firearms, whilst others distrusted anything hailing from Prussia. There was thus sufficient time for the new rifle

to be introduced throughout the Prussian army, and for so effective a disciplining of the infantry that every private was taught to handle his rifle with discretion. Nineteen years later the world was to learn how splendid an inheritance Boyen had bequeathed his nation.

The general's old-fashioned politeness preserved the sentimental tone of the epoch of the wars of liberation. Sapient folk often opined that the veteran had outlived his day. It was true enough that he no longer possessed in full measure the readiness and the daring which had characterised him in youth, but he was still invariably delighted to consider new ideas. He was ably served by Lieutenant-Colonel Griesheim and by other officers in the ministry for war, whilst during the innumerable committee meetings of these years he earned the friendship and admiration of the prince of Prussia, although the two men often differed in opinion. With Prince William's cooperation, a simplified drill was adopted for the infantry. In the cavalry, too, the dashing spirit of Frederician days was revived. During the prolonged peace, formal parade-ground arts had been in vogue, but these had been once more discredited since 1843, when General Wrangel had shown at the cavalry manœuvres how overwhelming was the attack of large masses of mounted troops. In the interim the army had been furnished with new regulations, and there had been instituted a carefully considered code of military punishments, the joint work of the ministry for justice and of the officers.

Army organisation, however, though its defects became more conspicuous year by year, remained unreformed. As population continued to increase, there involuntarily resulted an ever wider departure from the great principle of universal military service. During the mobilisations of the thirties, and subsequently in connection with all the Landwehr drills, masses of complaints had poured in, but the croakers were wrong in their contention that these signified the decay and extinction of the spirit of self-sacrifice in the Prussian people; they were, in truth, the inevitable outcome of the defective system of army organisation. Was it not natural that the Landwehrman should complain of injustice at being separated from wife and children, at being called away from urgent private affairs, when thousands of younger men, more efficient from a military point of view, were exempt from service? In 1847, shortly before his resignation, Boyen penned a memorial, *Survey of*

the Prussian Military System and its Cost since the Days of the Great Elector, expounding in this document the ideas which had guided him in his military legislation. He desired that there should be "a standing army capable of free mobility quite distinct from the other military forces of the country," for, owing to the great number of persons on furlough, a pure army of the line was, he said, "prior to the declaration of war the most immobile thing in the world." He insisted that this standing army must be composed to the extent of at least one-fourth of its strength of time-expired men who had re-enlisted, and the force must be numerous enough to enable all the men in the Landwehr to be trained in its ranks during a three years' term of service. But how little did the reality conform to these carefully considered principles! The standing army was so weak that it had no effective mobility at all when detached from the Landwehr. After 1830 the state, not for war purposes but simply in order to safeguard the frontiers, had been compelled to call to the colours the greater part of the first levy of the Landwehr, with results extremely unfortunate to the economic life of the country. The number of time-expired men willing to re-enlist was now very small, for the wages of labour were rising, and military service therefore offered few attractions in comparison with civil occupations. There were now no more than seven hundred and twenty re-enlisted men on the strength of the four infantry regiments of the line in each army corps. Even this reduced supply of re-enlisted men was largely nominal. In East Prussia, an impoverished region where wages were exceptionally low, in the year 1847 the first army corps had only four hundred and forty-nine re-enlisted men, whilst the Rhenish army corps at the same date actually had no more than one hundred and fifty such men.

Moreover, the great body of the troops still served for no more than two years. Most unwillingly, "only owing to the pressure of circumstances," had the late king approved this deplorable expedient of false economy. Subsequently, in 1837, he had insisted that the innovation must cease, "as soon as conditions shall render possible a general prolongation of the time of service in the infantry." His apprehensions proved but too well justified. It was true that the two years' service entailed a twofold advantage, inasmuch as henceforward a larger number of men could be called up, and all the

Landwehrmen could be trained in the standing army; whereas in the year 1831 the larger moiety of the Landwehr had consisted of Landwehr recruits imperfectly trained or without any training at all. On the other hand, the military efficiency of the army of the line declined. Lazy and reluctant soldiers took things easily, knowing that they would get their discharge at the end of two years. The officers were almost overwhelmed by the labour involved in the fresh training of half the strength of their companies every year. Again and again the prince of Prussia uttered warnings to the king, saying that experience showed how this undue shortening of the term of service was ruining the army.

Doubtless the Prussian army remained greatly superior to the other German contingents, but unfortunately this was at best faint praise. If Prussia were to be enabled to march confidently forward towards her great future, it was absolutely essential to venture a considerable expenditure upon the army, which for so long a time had been stingily treated. The finances of the country were flourishing, and the economic energies of the nation were by now sufficiently strengthened. A strong will was, however, indispensable for such a step, seeing that in Prussia the military system was so intimately associated with the general political organisation. If the crown could secure a speedy settlement of the unhappy constitutional dispute, in order that henceforward railway development might be assisted by legally permissible loans, the abundant surpluses, supplemented perhaps by a moderate increase in taxation, would furnish ample means for the reintroduction of three years' service, which was still the legally prescribed term. The standing army might be effectively reinforced by the incorporation of several classes of the younger reservists, so that the mass of men in the Landwehr might, as originally designed, serve as a rule in their respective provinces. Boyen, however, was now too old to entertain such bold ideas of reform. Prussia owed him her army law, and rare indeed are the men who can venture two such hazards twice in a lifetime. The king, finally, pacifist in disposition, was quite unsympathetic towards bold military plans. He had firmly resolved that there should be no increase in taxation during his reign. Public opinion, continually voicing complaints concerning the burden of military expenditure, would at that date have declared any strengthening of the army to be positive insanity. Long years,

years full of confusion, were to elapse ere the necessity for such an increase in military strength was to become generally recognised. Things therefore remained as they had been, and despite the more extensive enlistment the strength of the standing army was not increased by a single man. During these eight years army expenditure rose from 25,000,000 thalers to 28,000,000 thalers, for the re-arming of the infantry, the changes in the field guns, and the absolutely essential increases in pay of the older non-commissioned officers, necessitated heavy disbursements. In matters of detail, attempts at economy were sedulously made, often to the detriment of the service. The infantry drills were shortened, and in a newly elaborated mobilisation scheme considerable savings were promised even in the event of war.[1] When the minister for war resigned for the second time, the loyalty of the army was unchallenged; and its efficiency, now as formerly, was extremely satisfactory; but the force was so defective in point of organisation that in troublous times disagreeable experiences were practically inevitable.

Boyen's first resignation had been forced upon him because he had over-estimated the value of his Landwehr, and strangely enough during twenty years of peace he had not completely abandoned this favourite idea of earlier days. A soldier of genius, nothing was further from his mind than the layman's enthusiasm for an untrained national army. When people asked him why he had not simply retained the improvised Landwehr of the year 1813, he made the tart answer: "Because I wanted something better than the offspring of immediate necessity." Nevertheless he insisted that the Landwehr, though it was now composed only of soldiers who had served their time, must exist independently vis-à-vis the line. "It is in accordance with the spirit of the Landwehr," he wrote in his last memorial, "that its officers up to the rank of captain should be the issue of the force itself"; and he would not entrust comparatively old reservists to the leadership of young lieutenants of the line. But although nearly all the Landwehr officers were thoroughly patriotic, and although they had been scientifically trained, after so long a term of peace no more than a small proportion of them were highly disciplined in a military sense, and among these exceptions

[1] General von Reyher, Memorial concerning the Mobilisation Scheme (to Thile, April 9, 1847).

again there were but few able at any moment to lay aside their civic duties in order to follow the colours. Since the Landwehr likewise suffered from a dearth of non-commissioned officers, it was necessary to employ, above all for the responsible posts of company leaders, a large number of officers of the line detailed for this service. The late king, therefore, despite Boyen's opposition, had invariably endeavoured to preserve the circumscribed unity of the army, to maintain a firm union between the line and the Landwehr. The prince of Prussia and his confidant von Forstner, an unattached general, continued to hold this opinion. The new sovereign, however, allowed the minister for war to go his own way, and Boyen, having full confidence in the bourgeois "intelligentsia," appointed by degrees quite a number of Landwehr captains. In the years of revolution it became manifest that above all in the western provinces, which were accustomed to plume themselves upon the superiority of their culture, the number of inefficient Landwehr officers was extraordinarily great.

Very remarkable was the way in which the Prussian military organiser deviated in his methods from those employed by his exemplar Carnot. The Frenchman had strengthened the army by uniting the line with the national levies, but the German endeavoured to keep the two forces quite distinct. In 1847 he actually secured the issue of a royal command to the effect that in future the Landwehr squadrons should be commanded by officers of the line only when absolutely unavoidable —and this despite the fact that efficient Landwehr cavalry captains are even harder to come by than efficient Landwehr infantry captains. He appointed certain Landwehr officers to positions on the staff, although since 1820 this practice had fallen into almost complete desuetude. After manœuvres he invariably lavished praises on the Landwehr, and this had an unwholesome effect. The chief weakness of his second term of office was found in the favouritism he displayed towards the Landwehr, and it was natural that the officers of the line should often complain of Boyen. Even General Canitz used extremely unjust language in speaking of the veteran minister for war. In any case the tedious peace had aroused a great deal of ill-feeling in the army. Promotion was completely arrested; on the average the captains were older than they had been in the days before the battle of Jena, besides being worse paid and much harder worked. The line regiments were

discontented because the guards sent them badly trained officers. Even the younger princes of the royal house occasionally permitted themselves free criticism of the unwarlike sovereign.[1] Since the death of Grolman (1843) the prince of Prussia had been the hope of the army. Although in military circles he was always reserved in the expression of his opinions, it was known that he was little inclined to share the views of his royal brother.

Persistent quarrels between the army and the people, in a state where universal military service prevails, are invariably a sign of unsatisfactory political conditions. In Germany at this date, when the war office was in charge of a minister reputed to be liberal, conflicts between civilians and soldiers occurred more frequently than had ever happened before in Prussian history, a fact solely explicable through the morbid discontent of the time. The officers were partly to blame. There were frequent recurrences of the arrogant tone of 1806, and in Berlin General Müffling, the military governor, set a bad example by his contemptuous treatment of the municipal authorities.

Most blameworthy of all, however, were the leaders of the opposition faction, whose suicidal folly led them to irritate and revile the army, whereas the French demagogues used adroit flattery in speaking of the troops. In the pamphlets issued by the refugees, the most vulgar terms of abuse were not too strong to be applied to the doglike fidelity of the bestial mercenaries, but the moderate liberal journals likewise referred to the army with an unreasonable venom which we find barely comprehensible to-day. The military academies were termed "abortions dating from a remote epoch"; the barracks were haunts of vice and abodes of torture; the officers were presumptuous idlers; the whole military system was futile, and the existing army was to be replaced by civic levies or a militia. The traditional use of the familiar "thou" employed by officers to their men, and even the primitive German name of "Gemeinen" [common soldiers, i.e. privates], were stigmatised as dishonouring and offensive. The Prussian army was regarded as peculiarly anti-democratic, for the reason that in Prussia it was still quite impossible to demand the oath of fealty to the constitution. The extremists were now

[1] General von Thile, Memorial concerning Discontent in the Army, undated (probably written in 1847).

making additional requisitions. Except when on duty the officers were not to wear uniform and the soldiers were not to carry arms. Except when on duty there was to be absolute equality (the catchword of the day) among all ranks. Such equality, it was alleged, prevailed in France, and only in the course of duty was the officer entitled to exact obedience to orders; then only could he expect to be saluted. Many of the radicals hoped that chatter of this sort would stir up the ranks against their leaders, but disillusionment came speedily. The bonds of comradeship were not to be broken. The whole army was affronted by these manifold tokens of a disdainful attitude which was comprehensible enough in relation to the worthless troops of many of the petty states, but was gross ingratitude where Prussia was concerned.

In Königsberg, General Dohna became embroiled with the liberal bourgeoisie even more quickly than his predecessor Wrangel. When one of his lieutenants challenged a young barrister for the offence of lèse-majesté, and in the ensuing duel killed his opponent, the whole civilian population espoused the cause of the deceased. The demand was made that officers should be forbidden to visit the public garden. The commandant, who had certainly used very strong terms to express his contempt for Jacoby's supporters, exchanged some heated letters with the municipal authorities. The conservatives of Königsberg, had founded a pugnacious periodical, *Der Freimütige*, to aid them in their attack upon the dominant "Jacobyns," and since then the partisan spirit of the East Prussians, always fierce, had exceeded reasonable bounds. Similar incidents occurred in other garrison towns. In Mainz, in Coblenz, and in Cologne attempts were made to exclude unpopular officers from the clubs. It almost seemed as if men wearing his majesty's uniform and men wearing civilian clothing could no longer meet on peaceful terms. In 1847, at the Cologne kermis, a disorderly mob had to be dispersed by the soldiers with fixed bayonets, and a cooper was run through the body. He died of his wound, and was given a gorgeous funeral; the citizens attended by sections to take part in the affair and to maintain order, and to the alarmed authorities this seemed painfully reminiscent of Parisian revolutionary times. The king unfortunately increased the ill-feeling by his personal intervention in these wretched quarrels. Revisiting Old Prussia in 1845, he summoned the municipal representatives of

Königsberg to his presence, and made some caustic references to the before-mentioned duel, saying that if they did not mend their ways they need expect no further favours from him. When they defended themselves, he admonished them through the instrumentality of the lord lieutenant, as follows: "Knightly fidelity to the sovereign may be splendid and enheartening even when exaggerated, whereas the most direct encouragement of the opposite tendency and the refusal to put a hand to the noble work of peace are odious and disheartening." He was greatly embittered by "the scandalous expulsions from the Coblenz club." Concerning the dissensions in Cologne he went so far as to write: "Should this rabble retain the upper hand in the club, 'ALL' members of the civil service and the judiciary must immediately resign membership. Anyone who refuses to take this step will show himself to be animated by such sentiments that it is justifiable to declare in advance: *Your persistence in keeping* SUCH *company will be regarded as a* RESIGNATION OF YOUR POST. Here it is essential to display character and energy." [1]

Frederick William had never contemplated extensive transformations in the army. In the department of justice, on the other hand, the long-planned reforms were matters greatly after his heart, but the distinguished scholar to whom he had entrusted this task was little able to fulfil his expectations. There was scant trace of the vigorous legislation which Savigny's friends had expected. The press law did not come into existence, and the divorce law remained a fragment. Men of brilliant reputation, such men as no other modern legislator could call to his aid, were by degrees summoned to collaborate: "C. F. Eichhorn, Puchta, Homeyer, Stahl, Heffter, Bethmann-Hollweg, and others—but all to no purpose. Never before had the truth been so irrefutably proved that jurisprudence is invariably a political activity, and that erudition alone does not suffice in this field. Many years earlier, soon after Savigny had published his classical work *Legislation and Jurisprudence*, his brother-in-law Achim Arnim had entered into controversy with him to defend the right of the present against the historian. Though his own outlook was purely romanticist, Arnim, being a Brandenburg nobleman and magistrate, was intimately acquainted with the life of the common people.

[1] King Frederick William to Thile, February 22, 1844; February 23, 1847.

He begged his learned brother-in-law not to underrate the practical value of a modern system of law, a system that should be German and generally comprehensible. In Prussia even the peasant had never (as in the lands of the common law) looked upon the legal system "as a mysterious conspiracy and game of hazard," but had regarded it "as something honest, leal, and worthy." The Prussian code resembled the Lutheran Bible in that, though it was seldom really read by the people, it was frequently consulted by them, and with beneficial result. The layman's opinions had absolutely no effect upon the distinguished jurist. He became more and more strongly convinced that the essential thing was for the judiciary to be thoroughly grounded in the science of the law. He failed to understand that in certain epochs law-making, which he so profoundly despised, becomes a necessary evil. At such times the rapid mutations in all social relationships render positively indispensable a vigorous and even unduly hasty activity on the part of the legislature. Savigny lacked the strong and life-creating energy of will which transforms the jurist into the legislator; he lacked the practical ambitions of a Schwarzenberg or a Svarez. His advisers elaborated innumerable proposals, but these were invariably vetoed by him because they still fell short of perfection. When, after some years, he resumed his favourite scientific investigations, the work of his department was so completely arrested that even the king began to question the statesmanlike abilities of his revered preceptor.

In the year 1844, when the new disciplinary laws for the officialdom were promulgated, the laws that had been elaborated by Mühler's department, Savigny came in for a share of the disfavour voiced by the liberals. The Prussian civil code had simply declared that judges were irremovable, for in Frederician days each official had been appointed to a definite office. The French *charte*, likewise, specified nothing more. Article 100 of the Belgian constitution had established the precedent that a judge could not be transferred to another post without his own consent. This completely new principle, like everything that came from Belgium, had been gleefully adopted by the Rhenish judiciary, and the strong breeze from the west blowing throughout these years had carried the idea into the old provinces. Since the new disciplinary laws empowered the minister for justice to transfer judges, either in the interests

of the service or as a punishment, Heinrich Simon of Breslau, a stickler for juristic formalism, raised his clamorous voice, endeavouring with argumentative skill and appropriate pathos to prove that this innovation would destroy one of the pillars of Prussian liberty. Resigning his official position, he carried on a fierce paper war with old Kamptz, who, it need hardly be said, entered the lists for the ministry. It was equally a matter of course that the liberal press should display its enthusiasm for Simon. Ignoring the Prussian civil code, the newspapers insisted that their catchwords of the law of reason were actually valid in law, and since their mistrust of all government was accounted liberal, the unlucky king was accused of a desire to pervert the administration of justice. In reality the independence of the Prussian judiciary remained absolutely intact, and indeed, now that the spirit of opposition was making its way unremittingly into all circles of the officialdom, that independence was not infrequently misused for party purposes. When the court of the Paderborn highlands acquitted Lüning, a journalist who had been prosecuted for publishing a radical poem, the judges, forgetful of their duty, added to their decision (in itself far from unimpeachable) a statement of reasons which contained animadversions upon the Germanic Federation and the monarchical order. The king did not desire to make any further use of the supreme jurisdiction of the crown, and therefore determined not to quash the finding, but merely to administer a severe reprimand. None the less, this tiresome dispute concerning the disciplinary laws was to bear fruit in the future. Despite Simon's exaggerations it was obvious to all unprejudiced persons that in times of political struggle the transferability of judges might readily lead to abuses of power. The article in the Belgian constitution which guaranteed the judges against involuntary transfers was universally endorsed by public opinion, and was before long adopted by Prussia.

Uhden, a jurist of mediocre capacity, in political matters no less conservative than his teacher Savigny, but an excellent man of business, had meanwhile been appointed head of the department for the administration of justice. Possessing a keen eye for what was immediately attainable, he was clever in the choice of his instruments, and had been able to count upon the king's confidence since his resolute resistance to the czar's commercio-political intrigues. Uhden selected as chief

assistant Bornemann, a liberal who had remained faithful to his convictions during his tenure of office in the detested supreme board of censorship. Able, firm of will, and a thoroughly practical man, Bornemann, like most of the Prussian judges, had in earlier days sat at the feet of Savigny. But the master's profound erudition did not suffice him. After so many essays and schemes, it seemed to him that deeds were at length essential. A vigorous collaborator was found in Assistant Judge Friedberg, a young liberal whose selection Uhden had approved. Between the two ministries for justice there now arose a violent quarrel, like that between the ministry for commerce and the ministry for finance—an anarchy in the official world such as could occur only in this rudderless regime. The stalwarts of the administration of justice inflicted one reverse after another upon the ministry for legislation, for the king was eager to get something done, and his decisions were almost always unfavourable to his learned friend. A few days after the promulgation of the momentous law concerning criminal procedure which had rendered it possible for the Polish trial to be public, on July 21, 1846, Frederick William signed an ordinance providing for the simplification of procedure in civil cases. Its tenour resembled that of the law just mentioned, and like that law it had been drafted without the assent of the minister for legislation. In the following April (1847) there was promulgated a law dealing with the jurisdiction dispute, and this measure too ran counter to Savigny's views. Judicial reform was progressing, however slowly, and the jurists of Old Prussia were coming to entertain ideas concordant with those that inspired Rhenish law.

The constitutionalist movement, meanwhile, continually advanced throughout the country. In the year 1843 the king had curtly replied to the Posen diet, to the effect that he did not regard the ordinance of May 22, 1815, as legally binding, and thereby, as by his inexplicable delays, he had merely increased the general concern. At the provincial diets of 1845 an impatient and irritable mood was almost universally displayed. In Münster, Baron Georg von Vincke, son of Lord Lieutenant Vincke, said: "As she has done in the customs union, so also by the adoption of a liberal constitution, Prussia must place herself at the head of the German states." With these words he merely gave expression to what men of the

younger generation were all obscurely hoping, for a union was being established between Prussian ambition and liberalism. His proposal to petition the crown to establish a national assembly did not amongst the conservative Westphalians secure the legally requisite majority of two-thirds, but his vigorous oration roused echoes far and wide. A similar proposal secured more extensive support in the Rhenish diet. Beckerath, Camphausen, and nearly all the leaders of the bourgeoisie in Rhineland, championed the idea, their speeches expressing a proud conviction that under the protection of a constitution the institutions of free Rhineland could not fail to redound to the advantage of the entire Prussian state. The radicals of Elbing sent to the Prussian diet a petition which went far in advance of the royal promises, demanding in forcible and almost menacing words a territorial representation that should embrace all classes. How overwhelmingly had constitutionalist ideas made headway during four brief years. Except for the diets of Brandenburg and Pomerania, proposals for the granting of a constitution embracing the whole of Prussia were discussed in every provincial diet. In Saxony, alone of the six, did the proposal fail to secure a majority, but only in Prussia and in Posen was there a majority of two-thirds. When the ministry came to consider the upshot of these debates, it was plain that the great majority of all the deputies to the provincial diets now favoured the idea of a national representative system, and the statesmen in Berlin were honest enough to admit that many who voted with the minority had done so solely out of respect for the crown.[1] The king, however, since he would allow no one to show him the way, once more curtly rejected all such petitions, taking a similar course with regard to the Silesians' request for freedom of the press and the repeated proposals for publicity of debate in the diets. He was fond of boasting that no other country in the world possessed diets as independent as those of Prussia, and in truth corruption and electoral falsifications were still entirely unknown in his realm. Since he had so high an opinion of the estates, how could he possibly hope that they would rest content in perpetuity with his obstinately reiterated eightfold negation?

The press was busying itself once more with the constitutional question, now that Johann Jacoby, in a memorial addressed to the latest Prussian provincial diet, had revoiced

[1] Memorial of the Ministry for Home Affairs, May 13, 1845.

his former demands. The language of the Königsberg demagogue became ever more intolerant. Like a clamorous usurer he presented his bill of debts to the crown. Though everyone knew that the ordinance dated May 22nd had not been made public until after the battle of Belle Alliance, he contended that this ordinance had been issued to the Prussian nation as "an incitement to a fresh struggle" and as a reward for previous sacrifices. He even ventured to declare that the late king, ignoring his pledge, had failed to lay the provincial diet constitution before the inhabitants of the provinces for their consideration. It would seem, therefore, that this renowned publicist knew nothing whatever about the assemblies of notables held in the years 1822 and 1823. The press universally displayed an alarming ignorance of Prussian constitutionalist history, for during the last two or three decades public life had been utterly somnolent. A liberal bookseller issued a translation of Benjamin Constant's work *Du triomphe inevitable et prochain des principes constitutionels en Prusse.* Neither the publisher, nor the translator, nor any reader was aware that Constant's booklet had been merely a translation of an essay by Benzenberg upon Hardenberg's plans for a constitution, a writing which had made a great deal of noise in its day.[1]

Such being the posture of affairs, Röpell and Wuttke did good service when they published certain documents illustrating the history of the almost forgotten Prussian constitutionalist struggle of earlier days. Their contemporaries could learn more from these documents than from the collection issued by Nauwerk, the radical, who with astounding political naïvety reproduced all the ancient charters of the grand masters and of the dukes of Prussia, in the belief that these would demonstrate the need for a representative system. Councillor W. von Merckel, a man of moderate views who in subsequent parliamentary campaigns was always found in one of the centre parties, now gave drastic expression to the main ideas of the liberal opposition. In his pamphlet *The Rumour of a Constitution in Prussia* (1845) he wrote bluntly: "Hitherto we have existed only on sufferance, have been mere chattels." Preposterous as the statement was, it embodied the views actually held by young liberals. It seemed to them that the continued refusal to grant a constitution was an offence to the

[1] See vol. III, pp. 436 to 438, 502, 567 to 569.

Prussian people, to its dignity, its liberty, and its civilisation. This moral indignation constituted the strength of the opposition.

The adherents of the monarchy ruling through estates, who joined forces against Jacoby and his associates—Heinrich Leo pugnacious as ever, Henning the Old Hegelian, and Mendelssohn the brilliant Bonn geographer—had from the first to adopt an unfavourable position on the defensive. Though victorious in the field of theory, they did not sincerely believe in the viability of the inchoate system of representation by estates. The erudite tomes of the excellent Lancizolle concerning Prussia's monarchy and estates already gave the impression of being a voice from the tomb. This faithful Hallerian, like Schmalz and Marwitz before him, spoke of the different "states" of the royal house, for he regarded the modern state and its legal unity as an empty abstraction. Kamptz, of old the deadly enemy of the liberals, did great harm to the king's cause. In his retirement, he gave his ready pen free play, producing a whole series of monographs on constitutional law and also a popular pamphlet entitled *The* TRUE *Royal Word of Fredcrick William III*, wherein he proved again and again that the late monarch had promised his people absolutely nothing. Was it possible that this man who had grown grey in the ministerial service could fail to know that Hardenberg, originator of the ordinance of May 22nd, had definitely declared that this ordinance contained a solemn royal pledge?[1] So intense was his fanaticism that he may have believed himself to be telling the truth. This much at least is certain, that the innumerable coarse polemics of the detested demagogue-hunter, who now came forward uninvited as defender of the crown, inflamed the anger of the liberals against the person of the monarch.

Public meetings were being held in vast numbers, giving expression to the urge towards political activity. A citizens' union was formed in Königsberg, and here for the first time manual workers and university professors made common cause. When this organisation was proscribed, the members, to the number of six thousand or more, assembled every week at the Böttchershöfchen just outside the gates, and there, under the free air of heaven, everyone whom the spirit moved could speak to Europe at large. When these meetings were likewise

[1] See vol. III, p. 570.

prohibited by the police, Jacoby printed a savage writing, *Challenge to a Fair Hearing.* In Breslau the liberals met at the new railway station, and subsequently in one of the clubs of the town. Here too there were prohibitions and protests, but behind these innocent manifestations there was already at work a party of radicals, who on one occasion, when the king's birthday was being celebrated, manifested their existence in the most impudent way. In Halle the loyal burghers were in the habit of commemorating important incidents in natural history by festivals at the Bunch of Grapes in Giebichenstein. The religious movement of the enlightened friends was already on the wane, but the rousing orations of Max Duncker gave powerful expression to political passion. In Stralsund, Haselberg, a gifted physician, delivered lectures on "Contemporary Affairs." The Cologne carnival of 1844 was nothing less than a political satire upon the government, the censorship, and the legal codes. No less a man than General Friedrich Gagern, a courageous liberal, considered that such anarchy of minds and of trends could not long endure. The feeling was universal. The time had arrived when it was essential that the awakening bourgeoisie should have access to a stage for responsible political activities.

King Frederick William was aware of this fact; the fundamental ideas of his plans for a constitution had long ere this been formulated; and yet he could not make up his mind to bring matters to fruition. In the summer of 1845, after the dismissal of Count Arnim, who had opposed his designs, and after the summoning of a new constitutional committee, he desired to hear Metternich's opinion once more. The Austrian accepted the invitation reluctantly, having long since realised how little the king was influenced by anyone else's opinion, and he foresaw that whatever happened public opinion would regard him as Prussia's evil genius. In August, Metternich met Frederick William on the Rhine, where the king was receiving a return visit from Queen Victoria and was manifesting his delight by gorgeous displays. The British guests, though accustomed to such affairs, were filled with astonishment and admiration at the tattoo in the courtyard of Brühl palace, at the magnificent fireworks in Cologne, at the unveiling of the Beethoven memorial in Bonn, and at the salute of a thousand guns which thundered

from the ramparts of Ehrenbreitstein and from the hill fortresses of Coblenz. The queen of England was moved to tears when her illustrious host at Brühl, proposing her health in an enthusiastic speech, used words to arouse a cordial echo alike in British and in German hearts: "As in former days on the conquering field of Waterloo, so now amid the blessings of peace on the beautiful shore of the Rhine, Victoria!" The Germans, the Coburg-Gotha people of course excepted, did not find the lady thus extolled at all congenial. In the Rhinelanders' opinion she was "extremely English," and in the popular mouth this was far from being what it was at the court of Berlin, a commendatory term. Even Frederick William was considerably disillusioned by subsequent happenings. He had so earnestly desired that his beloved England should be closely united with the conservative powers of the east, but Victoria, after a trip to her Albert's Thuringian home, suddenly decided upon a detour on the return journey in order to visit the bourgeois king a second time at Eu.

During the Rhenish festivities the king of Prussia had several times discussed his designs for a constitution with Metternich and even with Aberdeen. This was simply the overflowing of a full heart, for from the British peer, well-meaning but dull and utterly ignorant of German affairs, the king could hardly have expected any useful advice. The Englishman admitted frankly: "I learned very little from what his majesty said to me." Metternich was confirmed in the opinion he had long held that nothing would move the king from his plan for a united diet. It seemed to the Austrian that the old Prussia had already been destroyed whilst the new one had not yet come into existence. With a feeling as if he had been looking at Holbein's Dance of Death, on his departure he uttered a prophecy which was speedily to be fulfilled, saying: "Your majesty may summon the six hundred deputies to the provincial diets as such, and they may depart as deputies of the entire nation." Speaking to some of the diplomats he expressed himself with his wonted boastfulness, saying, "I have killed the Prussian plan for a constitution." In reality he was uneasy. He had been greatly disturbed by the tidings of the disorders in Leipzig, which came to hand whilst the guests were being entertained at Stolzenfels. This seemed to him "an outpost skirmish" of the revolution, a renewed confirmation of his old contention

"that fire burns and aquafortis corrodes." In November he wrote warningly to Canitz: "You are undertaking a terrible number of things all at once, and this is necessarily dangerous. However vigorous a man is, affairs may be too much for him. I shall be told, I know, that the Prussians are loyal, phlegmatic, and not easily led astray. But I am unwilling to admit this to be wholly true either of the Prussians or of any other race on earth, with the possible exception of the Bedouin Arabs—for there is no counterpart to the desert and free life therein. . . . During my long career I have never stood still, but have invariably moved with the times. Never before, however, have I contemplated such terrible dangers, for to-day the revolution stands embodied, confronting a generation which has known nothing of the kind during a period of active struggles."[1]

The constitutional committee held prolonged sittings in July, and again in the end of September. It was composed of five ministers, the prince of Solms-Lich, and Rochow-Stülpe, marshal of the Brandenburg diet, an ultra-conservative. Except for the last-named,[2] all the members were agreed that a national assembly was indispensable. They wished, however, that the king, instead of summoning a shapeless united diet, should strengthen the already existing united committees and endow these with the competence of a national assembly. Had this been done, everything would have been much simpler. Rother, in especial, was most urgent in his warnings, "even in face of the royal displeasure." The members of the committee were unanimous in their protest against the establishment of a distinct house of peers, which was, they said, opposed to the existing constitution.[3] But what could warnings from a committee avail against Frederick William's stubborn will? He held obstinately to his designs. There was to be a united diet with a nobles' curia, though the formal establishment of this was to be postponed; the estates were in time of peace to approve all loans; they were to have the right of voting new taxes. This last was a traditional right of German estates, and he saw no danger in it, for in his view there was no prospect that direct taxation would be increased

[1] Metternich to Canitz, August 25 and November 6, 1845.

[2] Rochow-Stülpe, Memorial to the king, July 13, 1845.

[3] Report to the king from the immediate committee, October 13; Rother to Thile November 6, 1845.

within any measurable time, whilst the tariffs and most of the indirect taxes were prescribed by the customs union treaties. In one point only did he yield to his advisers, agreeing that the estates of the realm were not to be summoned to Brandenburg, for this would have suggested timidity and would have placed great obstacles in the way of conducting business.

For the second time the prince of Prussia entered a protest. The heir to the throne had not been privy to the deliberations of recent months, but he knew well enough what had been decided, and it had become a matter of conscience for him to send a brotherly letter to the king explaining that he could not accede to Frederick William's plans (November 20th). Though nothing could move him from his principles, he greatly excelled his brother in possessing a mobility of mind which invariably enabled him to reckon with facts. Realising that the monarch would never abandon the trinity of the conjoint diet, the united committees, and the provincial diets, he resolutely adopted this new standing ground, and faced the single problem, how what he regarded as the essence of the Prussian state, the living power of the crown, was to be maintained side by side with these three unwieldy limbs of the body corporate. The memorial he now sent in opened by speaking of the difficult position which the Prussian state had to occupy in the world as a great power and as a member of the Germanic Federation. In view of this position, "any institution which approximates to the constitutional, or might develop into a constitutional mechanism, is unacceptable to Prussia." To avert the danger he suggested that the national diet, which was to be composed of about one hundred and fifty members from the provincial diets, should deal exclusively with the national finances, whereas the united committees were to deal no less exclusively with legislative proposals. Were matters thus arranged, discussions of the budget could not be used to enforce new legislation, or conversely. A doctrinaire dread of providing that the estates should vote war loans seemed to him preposterous, for he knew the loyalty of his Prussians. He said simply: "The state has ample funds for the opening of a campaign. Should a loan become requisite during the course of the war, there can be no possible objection to summoning the national assembly." He held invincibly to the ideas of his father, who had always insisted that the assembly must have no more than advisory powers.

"The debates of the three representative assemblies," he wrote in conclusion, "must be *purely advisory*, there can *never* be any question of their having the right of supply."[1] In accordance with his brother's wishes, the king submitted the memorial to the committee, and shelved it on the strength of that body's adverse report.[2]

The heir to the throne had thus been repulsed once more. Yet the proposed constitution, whose details had been turned over in the king's mind so long, still failed to come into existence. Was the monarch's irresolution at fault, or was it his deliberate purpose to accustom his subjects to the much-extolled organic evolution? Whatever the reason for the delay, it was not until March, 1846, that he instructed the immediate committee to hold joint sittings with all the ministers of state, and these deliberations endured, with a number of interruptions, for a further nine months. At the very outset, on March 11th, the prince, as chairman, enquired whether a central representative body was essential, declaring frankly that he personally was not at all convinced on this point. With two exceptions, all those present gave an affirmative reply, and at the close of the decisive sitting Prince William declared no less frankly that henceforward he would admit that a national assembly was needed. Whereas further, in the previous year the formation of a united diet had been approved by only one of the ministers (Uhden), the proposal now secured a majority of nine votes, the prince and six others voting contra.[3] For very few of his proposals could William secure a majority. Most of the other members of the enlarged committee suppressed their grave misgivings. Accepting the traditions of the old absolutism, they could not look upon themselves as independent responsible advisers, and regarded opposition on point of principle as fruitless when the monarch had expressed his wishes. By December 17, 1846, the discussions had been practically finished and most of the king's proposals had been adopted.

At this juncture the prince announced his intention of sending the monarch a separate opinion. Visiting the court of St. Petersburg in the previous summer, he had greatly

[1] The prince of Prussia to the king, November 20, 1845, with a Memorial. See Appendix XXXVII.

[2] Report to the king from the immediate committee, December 8, 1845.

[3] Principal Report of the ministry of state and the immediate committee, April 28, 1846.

shocked the czar and the czaritsa by quietly declaring that he regarded the further development of representative institutions as essential.[1] But he confessed, to his profound sorrow, that he could not discern "the salvation of the throne and of the fatherland" in the means chosen by his brother. On this very December 17th he completed a detailed memorial wherein he referred once again to the hopeless cumbrousness of an assembly of all the eight provincial diets. At the same time he perspicaciously pointed out a fact which had previously been overlooked, namely, that this united diet would be indissoluble. In any case the king had determined to avoid general elections, the fever of "Urwahlen" as they were then termed —elections by the general body of voters. It was consequently impossible that a united diet composed of the totality of the eight provincial diets should ever be dissolved. "Thus the new Prussian consultative assembly would stand on a much firmer footing than the constitutional chambers of other states, states which possessed the right in the last resort to dissolve parliament and to order a new election. The prince therefore demanded that there should at least be established as a powerful counterpoise an upper house drawn from the healthiest aristocratic energies of the country. To his soldierly mind it seemed simply incomprehensible why the king, if he proposed to "create a completely new representative era," should hesitate to go beyond the formation of a nobles' curia. Foreshadowing his own destiny, he considered that the royal princes would find a suitable place only in an upper chamber sitting as an integral and independent body. They must not be exposed "to the storms of a great assembly where the medley of political passions would rage unchecked."

In the second place he issued a further warning against granting to the estates the right of voting supply. This, he said, would involve the surrender of a sovereign right which since the days of the Great Elector had secured independence for the Prussian throne and power for the state. Thirdly, he again demanded that the united diet should alone be empowered to deal with financial matters. Fourthly and lastly, he deplored the dangers of granting the estates an unlimited right of petition, saying that this might readily endanger the position of Prussia as a European power and the standing of the Prussian army. Manifestly the prince was

[1] Rochow's Reports, July 1 and 2, and August 25, 1846.

here referring to the dispute which had been going on for many years between himself and his friend Boyen. He gave a lively description of the way in which in every land the progressive parties were aiming at the abolition of standing armies, and were endeavouring to attain this end by devious paths, desiring first to weaken the army, demanding a reduction of the time of service for the regulars, and less frequent drills for the Landwehr. "This is why there is an obvious tendency to exalt the Landwehr at the expense of the line, to separate the Landwehr more and more conspicuously from the line, and to prove that strictly military organisation and rigid military discipline are not necessary to the Landwehr, but rather that the status of a national guard would become the Landwehr admirably. . . . If discussions and petitions of the aforesaid nature are to be permitted the united diet, and if the press, even more than heretofore, is to be granted its freedom, then the existence of the Prussian Landwehr, which has been the true honour, welfare, and glory of the fatherland for thirty-two years, will become impossible!!" If Prussia were no longer to be able to increase her army twofold or even threefold in time of war, "then Prussia must descend from the height to which her army has raised her." Thus clearly did the prince envisage the very events which, fifteen years later, he was to live and fight through. But at this date he never contemplated the possibility of his own accession to the throne. It was his duty, he continued, to advise, not against the fulfilment of the pledges given long before, but against the proposed method of fulfilment, which might readily lead to the exaction of a constitution, whereas the king himself had often said: "Prussia could never be granted a constitution, for in that very hour she would cease to be Prussia. . . . But yet another duty constrains me to this course—the sight of my son. By an unfathomable decree of heaven it seems certain that the crown is to pass to my line. It is, then, my sacred duty to see that the successor to the throne shall take over the crown with rights undiminished and with full dignity and power, as I see it before me to-day." Begging once more that all the princes of full age should be consulted, he concluded "with heart profoundly moved, and invoking God's gracious assistance."[1]

[1] The prince of Prussia, Memorial of December 17, 1846, with Postscriptum of January 4, 1847. See Appendix XXXVII.

The king, however, was by no means inclined to set a new course for his ship when it was so close to port. The prince's memorial contained profound and truthful ideas interspersed with a number of exaggerated apprehensions, but all alike failed to shake Frederick William's convictions, for the king considered his own judgment greatly superior to his brother's. He refused a formal consultation of the agnates, being here well within his rights; and he definitively approved the draft proposals of the committee. As soon as the monarch had made his decision, the prince of Prussia dutifully withdrew his opposition. Resolutely looking the future in the face, he spoke as follows in the committee: "A new Prussia will now come into existence. With the promulgation of this law the old Prussia will go down to its tomb. It is my hope that the new Prussia will be no less sublime and great than the old Prussia has been glorious and full of honour!" In order to fulfil the terms of his father's testament and to make some concession, at least, to his brother's wishes, the king summoned all the adult princes of his house, not to consult them as to the patent, but simply to communicate its terms to them. All expressed their loyal compliance.

On February 3, 1847, the anniversary of the first summons of 1813, Frederick William issued a brief "patent" announcing the new "representative institutions" which it had been decided to create in further development of the national debt law of 1820 and the provincial diet law of 1823. The king deliberately abstained from making any reference to the ordinance of May 22nd, for he regarded this as annulled. The patent was signed by the monarch alone, for he wished even in matters of form "to avoid any resemblance to a state fundamental law." [1] He even proposed to forbid the newspapers to employ the names "chambers," "popular representatives," and "peers" when speaking of the new institutions. His diet was to be something utterly different from "a system of popular representation in the modern sense of the term." The ministers had considerable difficulty in inducing the king to refrain from issuing such a prohibition, which would have aroused intense irritation.[2]

[1] Cabinet Order to the ministry of state and to the committee, November 7, 1846.

[2] King Frederick William to Thile, March 6, to Bodelschwingh and Uhden, March 13; Thile's Report, March 8; Report from Bodelschwingh and Uhden, March 20, 1847.

Simultaneously with the patent were issued three royal ordinances subscribed by the prince of Prussia and all the ministers of state, dealing respectively with the united diet, the united committee, and the national debt deputation. By the terms of these ordinances all the provincial diets were henceforward to assemble as a united diet whenever in time of peace the king should summon them for the approval of a loan, for an increase in taxation, or for any other reason. The united diet was granted the right of voting new or increased taxes, and was given the right of petition in respect of all domestic affairs. At the king's pleasure, it was to be invited to discuss legislative proposals. Within the united diet there was established a nobles' estate, to consist provisionally of the royal princes and seventy-two of the most distinguished members of the provincial diets, but the number was to be subsequently increased whenever the king should so desire. Where financial matters were concerned this nobles' estate was to sit and discuss jointly with the three other estates, but in respect of all other matters the nobles were to sit alone. The united committees were to continue in existence side by side with the new body. Henceforward they were to be summoned periodically at intervals of four years. As a rule, new laws were to be submitted to them for discussion, but as concerned isolated financial questions they might on occasions represent the united diet. In addition, the crown reserved the right of submitting general laws to the provincial diets at its discretion. Finally, the approval of war loans and the regular examination of the national debt accounts were to be the work of a national debt deputation of the estates, composed of eight members (one for each provincial diet), and meeting annually if not oftener.

Thus the king's original proposals were to be carried out almost unchanged. The work was essentially his own, and had been practically unaffected by the prolonged deliberation of his advisers. The step was a great one, far greater than Frederick William realised. He believed that the future of his constitutional work would still be decided solely in accordance with his own wishes. But so extensive a system of representation, once called into existence, would continue to move by its own momentum. Moreover, the plan involved two effective chartered rights. Railway loans had now become indispensable to the state, whilst in view of the extensive alterations in social

conditions a transformation of the system of taxation would be indispensable in the near future, little as the king realised the fact. Unwittingly and involuntarily Frederick William was piloting his state into the channels of constitutional life.

Yet how wilfully did the legislator spoil his finely conceived work by over-elaboration and arbitrariness! It seemed almost as if he must deliberately have intended to arouse criticism and protest on legal grounds. Why was the ordinance of May, 1815, which indubitably possessed legal validity and conflicted in no way whatever with the subsequent legislation dealing with the representative system, annulled almost wantonly? Was the expression "territorial representation" in that ordinance an expression very well suited to the description of the united diet, so detestable that on account of this single phrase a law must silently be set aside? Was it not inevitable that the united diet should doubt whether it was entitled to regard itself as the territorial representation prescribed by law, so long as it was unable to count on being summoned at regular intervals? Why was there not to be a definite bicameral system, instead of an estate of lords which was sometimes to sit jointly with the curia of the three estates, and sometimes to sit separately? This upper house, which was undoubtedly one of the happiest of the king's political ideas, remained an unfinished product; and in the form actually presented it could not possibly provide for the adequate representation of the aristocratic energies of the country. Of its seventy-two votes, the larger moiety belonged to Silesia and Rhineland; the great province of Prussia had only five votes, whilst Pomerania actually possessed no more than one. It was very natural, therefore, that the loyal Ritterschaft of the old provinces should be mortified, and should feel that it was being thrust into the background. Vainly did the prince of Prussia declare in his memorial that the aristocracy must be wholly won over by being duly honoured. Vainly did Count Arnim-Boitzenburg, at the eleventh hour, beg once more for the strengthening of the estate of lords.[1] The king would vouchsafe no information regarding his plans for the future. What was the meaning of the amazing provision that legislative proposals were to be laid, sometimes before the united diet, sometimes before the united committee, and sometimes before the provincial diets, according as the crown might direct?

[1] Count Arnim-Boitzenburg to the king, January 3, 1847.

Manifestly the king's intention, when he prescribed this artificial distribution of representative rights, was to ensure that it should be impossible for any one of the three representative bodies to acquire excessive powers. What he failed to realise was that the natural unconscientiousness of a many-headed representative system could be controlled only by a serious sense of responsibility. It was impossible that the diets and the committees should have any such sense of responsibility when they had no certain knowledge of the extent of their own rights. What, finally, was the purport of the illegal, and in truth useless, restriction of the right of voting loans?

All these deviations from the old laws seemed so objectionable that the monarch's magnanimous intentions and the important concession of the right of voting supply failed to secure their full meed of appreciation. Although, after the prolonged procrastination, the patent now made an almost entirely unanticipated appearance, very few persons displayed the joy and gratitude for which the king had looked. The popular mood was gloomy, the popular temper uncertain. It is true that Max Duncker and other loyal men of Halle sent an address of thanks to the throne. The inhabitants of Elbing, and those of Thorn likewise, proclaimed their delight. Even Ruge, the radical, expressed the opinion that the Prussians must not fail to take advantage of the possibility now first accorded them to engage in practical political activities. But on the Rhine, in Silesia, and above all in Old Prussia, not a few were found to demand that the royal gift should be rejected as inadequate. The circle diet of Neidenburg actually passed a resolution suggesting that the deputies ought to declare themselves incompetent until they were granted their full rights. In the Strasburg circle, von Hennig, the loquacious young lord of the manor, opened his career as a liberal with a similar attempt.[1]

The alarm signal for these irreconcilables was sounded by Heinrich Simon in his pamphlet *Acceptance or Rejection?* In his struggle against the disciplinary laws he had shown courage and steadfastness, but had likewise displayed many of the subtleties of the professional advocate. Lawyers prized his writings upon Prussian constitutional law—useful works, indeed, but distinguished rather for prolixity than for brilliance.

[1] President Wallach's Report to Bodelschwingh, April 29; von Nordenflycht's Report to Bodelschwingh, April 7, 1847.

Being nephew of Councillor Simon, who had done meritorious service in the administration of justice in Rhineland, Heinrich Simon could count upon a friendly hearing from the liberals of the west. Since, moreover, baptism notwithstanding, the Jews continued to look upon him as one of themselves, all the newspapers sang his praises to a degree which satisfied even his exalted self-conceit. Despite this foible, he must have possessed a peculiar personal charm, which is not obvious to those who know him only through his dry juristic writings. Two rival poetesses, Ida Hahn-Hahn whom he loved, and Fanny Lewald whom he spurned, adored him with equal fervour. Even Radowitz, his opponent, meeting him casually on a journey, was quick to recognise Simon's uncommon excellencies. *Acceptance or Rejection?* it is true, was far from deserving its ephemeral renown, for it contained nothing beyond the futile alternative habitually voiced by the radicals. "We asked for bread and you gave us a stone," such was the opening phrase; and the author went on to develop the long abandoned theory of civil law by which a representative constitution was regarded as a contract between crown and people. He maintained (an error barely pardonable in a skilled lawyer) that the patent had the effect of "depriving the people of its few civil rights." He went so far as to praise the suspensive veto of Norway, saying that "one individual" ought not to count for more than the will of millions. He warned the king to discard the notion that the rights of the crown were God-given. The monarch, he said, should rather be guided by the proverb, "Vox populi, vox Dei!"

Frederick William was greatly enraged. In the first burst of anger he demanded the dismissal of the censors who had been guilty of the "crime of failing to confiscate such a book." But on further investigation it transpired that the writing had been published in Leipzig, as a twenty-sheet book exempt from censorship.[1] The crude obviousness of Simon's theory of the contract necessarily commended it to the half-cultured. For the further enlightenment of the public, Simon's publisher now issued *A Comparison of the Prussian Constitution with the Constitutions of Electoral Hesse, Norway, and Belgium.* It was known, said the writer, that these three states had "made the concessions due to the zeitgeist"; and since the zeitgeist counted for everything, history for nothing at all,

[1] King Frederick William to Thile, March 15, 1847.

every intelligent reader must draw the conclusion that the free Electoral Hessian was a far happier being than the Prussian thrall. The refugees, too, conveyed across the frontier copies of a lampoon entitled *The Patent.* In this work we read: "All hopes have been betrayed; all illusions have been dispelled. Through democracy alone can the people come to its own, and there is no democracy without a republic! Give us our rights, or blood will flow!"

So foolish, so ungrateful a radicalism could make no headway among the thoughtful majority of the Prussian nation. At a meeting of Rhenish deputies held in Cologne, after a heated discussion, a resolution was at length passed approving the attempt at an understanding, and it speedily became apparent that most of the provincial representatives were determined to follow the king's call with traditional loyalty. The South German liberals were likewise of opinion that a rigid negative would be of no avail. Even Welcker, as ever the fierce enemy of Prussia, issuing a confused monograph entitled *Fundamental Law and Fundamental Contract,* and adorned with all the catchwords of the obsolescent law of reason, came to the conclusion that the Prussian nation must utilise this opportunity with joy. "Found for yourselves," he wrote, "a plenitude of such freedom as is known to other lands." Gervinus, too, felt it his duty to say his word on the matter, although he knew even less than Welcker knew of Prussian affairs. Gervinus lacked what the honest and choleric Welcker at least possessed to a degree, the publicist's first virtue, an untrammelled mind and the confidence given by a will firmly directed towards the goal. Luxuriating in the sense of his own perfections, Gervinus talked all round the subject, but never really succeeded in saying what he wanted. In his malicious booklet, *The Patent of February 3rd,* he discharged such a volley of invectives at Prussia that his gentle friend Jacob Grimm, seriously alarmed, felt impelled to declare: "Were all this true, were it true that we are ruled by means of lying and fraud, I should feel it necessary to quit such a country at all costs!" In sum, the censures amounted to no more than this, that Prussia was unhappily Prussia, and not Hesse-Darmstadt or Saxe-Meiningen. Yet all the time Gervinus imagined himself the most faithful of Prussia's friends. As far as any definite suggestions could be discovered amid the mass of abusive terminology, it appeared that the author did

not desire to recommend a direct refusal of the proposed constitution; but he did his utmost to hinder a reconciliation of the parties. Whilst the writings that have been named were widely read, hardly any attention was paid to Haller, the restorer, when in profound concern he issued a pamphlet warning the crown against unduly extensive concessions.

The advocates of unconditional rejection were thus outvoted for the time, but a genuine harmony had by no means been established. This government of misunderstandings remained true to its character. The king imagined that with the issue of the patent he had settled matters for a long time to come. Public opinion, on the other hand, considered that all that had been effected was merely the beginning of a freer political life, and it had already become plain that the conflict between the crown and the people would be concentrated on the question of the periodic summoning of the diet. If the united diet were to become sure that it would be summoned at regular intervals, this body would then be justly entitled to regard itself as the legally established territorial representation. The united committees would thereupon cease to have any importance, and it would be easier to come to terms in the matter of the subsidiary dispute concerning the war loans and the debt deputation. Three distinct parties made common cause in this demand for a periodic summoning of this assembly. The first of these parties comprised all those thoughtful persons who desired that there should be an end to the uncertainties that prevailed in public law. Next came the declared liberals, who considered that a many-headed parliament would subserve their party aims better than would a petty committee. The third faction was that of the high nobility, for the members of this order hoped to gain political power through the estate of lords in the united diet, whereas they were represented by but few votes in the united committees. Kühne realised the situation, and dreaded a "coalition monstrueuse" between the extreme liberals and the aristocrats. In writing and by word of mouth he laid his views before his old friend Bodelschwingh. "This great assembly," he wrote to Bodelschwingh, "will not terminate peacefully unless the king, in good time and before he is actually compelled, yields upon the one decisive point, and concedes to the united diet, as he has already conceded to the united committees, the right to be summoned at stated intervals."[1]

[1] See Appendix XXXVIII.

How heavy was the burden now laid on Bodelschwingh. Long ago, during the War of Liberation, he had been wounded in the lung by a French bullet, and at this juncture he was once more attacked by severe inflammation of the lung, which had been liable to recur ever since he had been wounded. Escaping narrowly with his life, he remained unfit for work throughout March. Still barely recovered, with heroic energy, and himself a novice in parliamentary matters, he took his stand almost alone to face the storms of this assembly. Being both minister for home affairs and cabinet minister, upon him in the first instance devolved the duty of representing the crown's cause, and it soon became apparent that he was distinguished from all the other ministers by the possession of exceptional oratorical gifts. A nephew of Baron Bodelschwingh-Plettenberg who had in earlier years so obdurately championed the rights of County Mark, a favourite of Stein and of old Vincke, Westphalian to the core, he had occupied numerous posts during a remarkably successful official career, inspiring affection wherever he went, and winning the respect of the Rhinelanders even during the unhappy days of the Cologne episcopal dispute. To the Westphalians of the earlier generation, his personality strongly recalled that of Justus Möser. Extremely simple in his dress, he attracted attention at once by his tall, soldierly figure and by the honest expression of his large eyes. His whole personality radiated elemental energy and ingenuous freshness. General Gerlach, anything but partial to the "liberal" minister, actually said of him: "Adam must have looked rather like Bodelschwingh." The last notable representative of the old absolutist officialdom, it was with him a point of conscience to display all the self-renunciation of the Old Teutonic vassal in defence of the king's wishes, in so far as these were not in plain conflict with the law. When the terms of the patent were being discussed he had raised a number of objections, such as were obvious to this man of affairs. Now that the first surprise and ill-will had subsided, he could not fail to recognise in his secret heart how sound was Kühne's judgment of the matter. But the monarch had spoken, and his will must be fulfilled. At the opening of the united diet, Bodelschwingh, pressing his faithful friend's hand, expressed his firm intention to support the patent.[1]

[1] Kühne's Memoirs.

§ 2. THE UNITED DIETS AND THEIR COMMITTEE.

When the members of the united diet assembled in Berlin at the beginning of April, there opened the first great parliamentary struggle in German history. This was a drama to throw into the shade all disputes of the petty diets, and, to the general surprise, it was made manifest how mighty were the state-constructive energies at Germany's disposal in this realm of Prussia. With the exception of the little group of Poles, all the men who here came together, men from the Belgian frontier and from the Russian, men from the shores of the Baltic and from the hills of Thuringia, were united in regarding themselves as sons of a single people, and were proud to bear the name of Prussian. During the prolonged and wholesome tranquillity which had marked the reign of the late king, the ancient tribal hatreds and the separatist local traditions had to a considerable extent faded from memory, though had there been a free play of public life, such a change would have occurred far less readily. Subsequently, during the stimulating reign of the new monarch, alike in the east and in the west fresh political ideas had originated, ideas which could easily become the driving force of great parties embracing the whole of Prussia. Already during the preliminary proceedings people realised that these new party contrasts, for all the separations they involved, exercised on the whole a consolidating influence. Party cleavage ran right athwart provincial divisions. The majority of the Rhinelanders and of the East Prussians constituted the core of the opposition, the most widely separated territories in the kingdom thus uniting in political friendship. Like the estates of the united diet, the provinces were entitled to demand the "itio in partes"; but on two occasions only, at the very outset of the session, did a few isolated hotspurs endeavour to avail themselves of this dangerous privilege. Each time the effort was fruitless. The diet wished to remain an integral whole. All separatist ambitions were restrained by the spontaneous energy of national unity and by the momentous earnestness of the idea of the Prussian state. This, above all, was what Metternich had dreaded. He was well aware that Austria and France were born foes to German unity, and he warned Guizot how great were the dangers in which this diet threatened to

involve both the Austrian and the French court. In addition, he fostered the particularist anxiety of the king of Würtemberg, referring to the dangers of Germanism and to those of the conception of nationality, "a conception which says everything or nothing." As a firm bulwark against the Germany which was growing in the north, he sang the praises of the Germanic Federation, the natural prop of particularism.

For the first time since there had been a kingdom of Prussia the estates confronted the crown as an independent power. How vigorous and how manifold was the aspect of the national life which here suddenly secured expression; how little elsewhere in Germany had there been any understanding as yet of the grand relationships of the real German state. "Prussia once more possesses a nobility," declared a truthful liberal journal in amaze. It was, indeed, obvious that the current caricature of Prussian junkerdom had no application to the sturdy, cultured, patriotic noblemen present in the united diet, many making themselves spokesmen of liberalism, and all voicing their sentiments with equal candour. Not a few of these nobles, more liberal-minded than those of Bavaria, went so far as to declare themselves ready to renounce patrimonial jurisdiction. Even more surprising to the Germans of the lesser states was the proud self-confidence of the Prussian bourgeoisie, whose role in the earlier history of the monarchy had as a rule been extremely modest. This class, which had gathered strength rapidly under the aegis of the customs union, now gave definite expression to its powerful economic interests. The strictly Protestant Prussia of old days had, moreover, passed away. The parity of creeds was universally and sedulously respected in all the formalities. The enlightened Berliners, haters of the Catholics, simply could not understand why the diet kept the festival of Corpus Christi.

Life in Berlin acquired a freer and more metropolitan character, now that the princes and counts of the west, the grandees of Silesia, and the nobles of East Prussia, all of whom had hitherto dwelt quietly at home, put in an appearance at court, whilst the king invited likewise to his levees the representatives of the towns and of the rural communes. It was through these beginnings of the parliamentary struggle that Berlin gradually assumed the genuine characteristics of a capital city. How richly equipped, too, was this first diet in oratorical talent; how many among its members were bold,

experienced, and trustworthy men. Even Metternich was astounded at the "parliamentary soundness" of this youthful assembly. It was not generally known abroad that most of the deputies were anything but novices, having been trained for a number of years in the modest school of the provincial diets, learning there the art of public speaking and the tactics of parliamentary life. In the joint labours of the united diet they were now to reap the fruit of their accumulated experience. As inevitably happens in an epoch of expectation, a fine emotional strain was still predominant in their eloquence. Nevertheless, passion was invariably kept within the limits imposed by good manners, and never again has Prussia known so dignified a parliament. All spoke of the monarch with profound veneration. Not a few displayed extravagant admiration, one opposition speaker referring to Frederick II as the greatest king Prussia had known prior to the year 1840. At court the name "Frederick the Great" was considered unseemly, for it was held that the new age of peaceful wisdom was to outshine all the warrior deeds of our heroic forefathers.

From the first the members of the opposition manifested a sense of decisive superiority. They were inspired with the consciousness of a great mission. They hoped that the development of representative institutions would bring about more friendly relations between the Prussian state and the rest of Germany, and would in the end secure for Prussia the leadership of the nation. In the assembly rooms of the Russische Hof and the Französische Hof, where the opposition, knowing nothing as yet of the party whip, was accustomed to hold its free deliberations, there would foregather in addition to the deputies many liberals from other regions: Jacoby from Königsberg; Count Reichenbach; Heinrich Simon and Stein from Silesia; Biedermann from Leipzig; Beseler and others from Schleswig-Holstein. They all expected that Prussia's national assembly would give a new turn to German history. By the movement of these days, young Julian Schmidt was diverted from literature to politics. The king would not allow any members of the general public to attend the sittings of the diet, but a full record of the debates was printed, with the names of the speakers, and although the shorthand writers, being as yet somewhat incompetent, were usually a week late in reproducing their notes, all cultured persons followed the parliamentary campaign with lively interest! The *Kölnische*

Zeitung, wishing to provide the Rhinelanders with parliamentary reports a day in advance of the other journals, had the Berlin newspapers expressed from Minden by a special service of mounted couriers.

The attitude of the government seemed infirm and uncertain when contrasted with the confident demeanour of the opposition. The ministers loyally obeyed the commands of their royal master, although not one of them possessed complete understanding of the monarch's plans. For the like reason the conservative deputies, whose meeting place was the Englische Hof, were unable with the best will in the world to give effective support to the crown. What issue was possible from this legal confusion, for which Frederick William was alone responsible ? Spurning Count Arnim's advice, the king had refused to remain upon the unimpeachable foundation of his father's laws. Whereas, on the one hand, he had deprived the estates of certain ancient rights, he had, on the other, granted them new and even greater rights. But the point upon which all turned was that he had reserved wholly to his own discretion the resummoning of the united diet, thus leaving an element of vagueness in the constitutional structure which was to have been definitively completed. It was quite impossible for the absolute monarch, who had just voluntarily accorded such extensive concessions, to modify his new legislation directly he was requested to do so by the diet. This pliability would have inflicted too severe a blow upon the prestige of the crown and upon the personal pride of Frederick William.

The result was that the diet, moderate, reflective, and thoroughly loyal, was faced with an almost insoluble legal problem. The deputies said: "Either we are the territorial representation promised by the late king, and in that case we must demand all the rights that were to be assigned to such a body; or else we are a diet called at the will of the new ruler, and in that case we are not entitled to exercise the rights of the territorial representation. Bold, practical politicians, like the young dike-reeve Otto von Bismarck who now made his first appearance in public life, might well laugh such scruples out of court, for it was absolutely certain that the united diet would become a permanent state institution. To the majority, however, strictly law-abiding persons, these loyal difficulties seemed wellnigh insuperable. Unfortunately, too, the conduct of the opposition was disordered by a secret inveracity. The

men who made so strong an appeal to legalist considerations were in truth desirous of securing far more than the old laws promised. They had no scruples about accepting the new right of voting supply which the king had granted in contravention of the old laws, for they regarded it as a valuable prize, tacitly secretly hoping that they would be able to force the monarch step by step into new courses. Most of the Rhinelanders and many of the representatives of the great eastern towns looked for a constitution upon the Belgian model. The goal of the liberals among the nobles was a powerful assembly of the estates.

The king had himself opened the door for all these endeavours by his treatment of the legal problem, a treatment at once arbitrary and amateurish. The risks of his policy were the greater seeing that behind the estates there were at work other forces, the forces of those who aimed at something far more extensive than was envisaged by the diet The radical party, whose power could no longer be ignored, did not possess a single spokesman in the assembly. On rare occasions only did some isolated utterance of one of the peasant deputies betray a profound and repressed social discontent. Kraus from Silesia, a hereditary village mayor, once declared that he and his fellows had been asleep for thirty years, but had at length awakened to the consciousness of their rights. By the electoral law, the broad masses of the urban operatives were left unrepresented; and equally without representation was the powerful class of divines. If the crown could not come to an understanding with a diet exclusively representing the settled, propertied, conservative elements of society, a peaceful evolution of political life could hardly be anticipated.

With regal pomp, headed by the insignia of the realm, on April 11th Frederick William entered the magnificently restored White Hall of the palace in order to open the diet with a formal address. All the royal princes were in his train, not excepting Prince Charles. Of the same way of thinking as his Russian brother-in-law, infuriated at the constitution of the "chambre monstre," Prince Charles of Prussia had remained in Italy until the last moment, returning to Berlin only upon the monarch's express command.[1] Little as he could foresee it, this was the last occasion on which

[1] Knyphausen's Report, April 11, 1847.

the king was to speak to his subjects with all the freedom of an absolute ruler, to speak from the depths of his heart, using language as straightforward as had ever been used by the wearer of a crown. He was, as it were, luxuriating in the buoyancy and brilliance of his own richly endowed and yet utterly unpolitical mind. As well-informed persons could not fail to have anticipated, he declared that his father's work in creating a constitution had now been completed, and he warned the estates not to endanger this work by immediately yielding to an insatiable craving for innovation. He told them to bear in mind, as he had some years earlier told the united committees, that they were not there "to represent opinions"; it was their function, he said, to fulfil ancient German custom by safeguarding their own rights. He reminded them of the "unparalleled hereditary wisdom" which had created the English constitution "without any scrap of paper." Though he had himself just issued the written words of the patent, he gave a solemn assurance to the following effect: "No power on earth shall ever induce me to transform into a conventional and constitutional relationship that relationship between prince and people whose naturalness and immanent truth make it among us one of such transcendent force. In no circumstances could I ever agree to the suggestion that between our Lord God in heaven and this land there should be allowed to intrude itself a written charter playing as it were the part of a second providence, a charter to rule us with its paragraphs and to replace the old foundations of loyalty." Manifestly moved, he spoke of the onslaughts of the press, though the journals stood on a level so infinitely beneath him, saying: "From all the indignities to which I and my regime have been exposed during the last seven years, I appeal to my people." Exhorting his faithful estates to join forces for the campaign against the disloyalty and the evil lusts of the day, he made his profession of faith in the words: "I and my house desire to serve the Lord. In verity!" As regards the future, the estates received no more than a fatherly assurance that the king would resummon them at some later date to approve new taxes and loans. "For the rest," he said, "I shall summon you when I think it expedient, and I shall do it willingly and often should the conduct of this diet be such as to prove that I can do so without affecting the discharge of my higher duties as a ruler."

The king's speech alarmed and confused its hearers. Impressed though everyone was by the strength of an exceptional personality, all that could in the end be gathered from the grandiloquent and somewhat obscure phraseology was that the king was absolutely determined to keep the estates from any approximation towards the constitutionalist parliamentary system that prevailed in the lesser German territories, and that he would reserve for the dictates of his own wisdom and grace the further development of institutions that were to be quite peculiar to Prussia. This was a great blow to the liberals, to whom the patent had seemed nothing more than the starting point for further advances. Many of the hot-blooded East Prussians desired to take their departure immediately, considering that it was impossible to come to terms with the crown, but their more politic Rhenish friends talked them over and induced them to remain. At the opening of the first sitting, the lead was taken by Count Schwerin, a Pomeranian of a celebrated fighting family. Schwerin had a broad, squat figure and an easy bearing; the expression of his countenance was vigorous and frank; but his long dark locks gave him an air of almost fanatical piety. Schleiermacher's son-in-law, he was a friend of Arndt and other scholars with patriotic views. At the general synod he had candidly advocated a moderate liberalism in ecclesiastical matters. He now proposed that the diet should present the monarch with a grateful address, but should at the same time give expression to its objections on legal grounds. The address was drafted by F. von Beckerath of Crefeld, a distinguished orator of the Rhenish provincial diet. His cradle, as he was fond of recounting, had stood beside his father's hand loom, but by his own energies he had now become a wealthy merchant. A Mennonite, he was by no means free from Quaker unction, which, despite his political views, ensured for him the king's friendly interest. His moderate liberalism was tinged with a peculiar lyrical pathos. Enthusiasm became him well, for in his case it was profoundly felt, and it never degenerated into mere phrase-making. "Here," he exclaimed, "is the very pulse of a new and rejuvenated Prussia, of a Prussia who, attended by the sympathy of her sister states in Germany, will lead the German nation forward to its rightful place among the civilised peoples of the earth."

Count Arnim noted with concern that the legal obscurity whose dangers he had so frequently represented to the king

was already bearing evil fruit. Beckerath's address contained extremely serious protests on legal grounds. If the king were to reject these protests, the diet would come to an end before it had really begun, for the assembly was indissoluble. The prince of Prussia had pointed the fact out to his brother in advance, and it was now plain to everyone how true had been his words. In the event of a breach between the crown and the estates, the patent itself would be void of effect, and the state would perhaps have to endure a violent convulsion. Arnim therefore felt it his duty to espouse the cause of the crown, which had vainly been warned of what would happen. He proposed an amendment to the address, in which the legal objections were merely indicated in outline and somewhat timidly. In the lengthy debates which now ensued, two orators came to the front, men whom the government was henceforward to dread as its most dangerous foes, Hansemann the bourgeois liberal and Vincke the liberal aristocrat. Once again recently had Hansemann displayed his great business capacity in a number of railway enterprises. As far as politics were concerned, he aimed at the constitutionalist regime of the upper middle class, such as obtained in Belgium. In him was embodied the typically modern mercantile view of the state, the view of those whose political conceptions were all topsy-turvy, a view which continued to gain adherents in an age of progressive industry and increasing luxury. To Hansemann it seemed that the army and the officialdom were superfluously maintained at the charges of the merchants and manufacturers, whereas in truth industry and commerce, money and exchange, would have no existence at all without the state, its laws, and its weapons. With quite as good reasons, therefore, it could be declared that the wealthy stockbrokers are maintained, in part at least, by the labours of the ill-paid state servants. In the diet his language was cutting, and he often spoke with plebeian bluntness. The estates, he said, had to decide whether they were animated by a sense of rectitude, or whether they were to be blindly confiding and to live upon sufferance.

A far more powerful orator was Ernst Vincke a stout, bull-necked young man, and a typical aristocrat, though somewhat careless in dress and deportment. With a large head and bushy red whiskers, he had the forceful ugliness which has often proved serviceable to distinguish orators. He was, indeed, the most brilliant speaker known to Prussian parlia-

mentary annals, being unrivalled as a ready-witted debater, but he had no talent for constructive statecraft, nor was he even an able party leader. All his power lay in open struggle, in attack. What a delight it was to him, when one of the speakers on the other side was holding forth, to watch the opponent piercingly with bespectacled eyes, making scornful interruptions the while. When his turn came, he would spring to his feet and, standing with his hands in his pockets, he would pulverise the unhappy previous speaker with telling arguments, cruel jests, and if need be with stormy indignation. The king detested him, for Frederick William took everything as a personal matter, and could not endure to see the son of the most loyal among Westphalians leading the ranks of the opposition. During the closing years of his life, Lord Lieutenant Vincke, too, had been somewhat grieved on account of the liberal views held by this young official and member of the Westphalian diet. Yet at the bottom of his heart Vincke, junior, had in truth far more aristocratic pride than had the old lord lieutenant, ever simple and friendly to the people. Ernst Vincke was proud of his ancient lineage, and it was his ambition to follow the example of his numerous ancestors who had "tilled the field of the law." In actual fact his view of this inviolable foundation of law was somewhat arbitrary. He looked upon the rights of the estates as a trust handed down from our fathers, as "a rigid list of privileges, to which additions might be made, but from which no deductions were permissible." For this reason he accepted the newly granted right of voting supply, whilst demanding none the less the fulfilment of all previous promises down to the very last letter. He refused to agree to any expression of gratitude in the address, demanding that it should contain nothing but a protest on legal grounds, and contending that protests and thanks were mutually exclusive. Several other speakers with exceptional gifts made their voices heard in the new assembly. Among these was Mevissen, one of the founders of the *Rheinische Zeitung*, who had learned a good deal since then, and who now insisted, quite in the spirit of Beckerath, that if only the united diet would annually scrutinise all the state finances, Prussia would no longer be compelled to regard her lesser neighbours with envy, but would acquire the leadership of Germany. On the opposite benches sat Prince Felix Lichnowsky, the impudent and overbearing Carlist adventurer. To the

universal astonishment he had espoused the cause of the crown, but his utterances were by no means reactionary, and although his abilities were far less conspicuous than had been those of his exemplar Mirabeau, he indisputably possessed talent, courage, and energy.

A brief speech by the prince of Prussia made a great impression. Answering to the challenge conveyed in a reproach by Hansemann, as the king's first subject and first adviser he gave a solemn assurance that during the discussions concerning the ordinances of February 3rd neither he nor the other members of the council had harboured any suspicions, but it had, said the prince, been their expectation that " the maintenance of the liberties and rights of the estates must never be effected to the detriment of the rights and liberties of the crown." The substance of the speech was conciliatory, but its tone was dictatorial. The prince spoke like a general used to command, and since the house in its ignorance did not realise that the heir to the throne could speak to them in no other way, the scandalmongers of Berlin seized upon these simple words. As the darling of the army, the prince was necessarily suspect to all malcontents. Rumours that his sentiments were reactionary had long been rife, and these rumours were now assiduously spread abroad, by Varnhagen in the drawing-rooms, and by various unknown persons among the mob. William was universally regarded as his brother's evil genius, although at the time he was quite without influence, and had merely endeavoured, as a trusty soldier, to defend the cause of his royal master. During these April days, tumultuous crowds paraded the streets, and the windows of the prince's house were broken. This was a shadow of coming events ; the liberal newspapers exculpated the heroic deed with the questionable assurance that the sight of the plate-glass windows of the modest princely palace had given the poor hunger-stricken fellows in the crowd too painful a reminder of their own miseries.

At length, in order to secure an understanding between the parties, Alfred von Auerswald suggested a new and somewhat more vigorous drafting of Arnim's amendment to the address. Auerswald, a loyal man who had been the monarch's close associate in earlier days, desired above all that a breach with the crown should be avoided, but was unwilling to abandon what he conceived to be the legal rights of the estates. In

the address, reworded as he suggested, the diet, after expressing its cordial gratitude, went on to say that it would "maintain and preserve as treasures of inestimable value the prestige and power of the crown and also the rights of the estates." In view of these aims it expressed its intention to examine somewhat more closely the divergencies of the patent from the earlier laws, and besought the monarch to take the first opportunity of harmonising any contradictions that might exist. The motion was adopted by a large majority, and the proceedings of the diet were thereby given a definite stamp from the outset, that of an opposition policy, respectful and thoughtful, but firm and resolute. On April 22nd, the king responded in gracious terms to the effect that the legislation of February 3rd was inviolable as far as its principles were concerned, but, he continued: "None the less, we do not regard it as absolutely finished, for it is capable of development." He instructed the estates to make further proposals, and spontaneously pledged himself to resummon the united diet within four years. Thus the king yielded a step, which he must have found difficult enough seeing that he had so recently warned the diet against greed for innovations. But he could not bring himself to promise periodical sessions, although all unprejudiced persons, including the foreign diplomats, felt that nothing but such a pledge could settle the unhappy quarrel. Count Knyphausen, the Hanoverian envoy, ventured to report in this sense, but was chidden for his pains by the old Guelph ruler in the following marginal note: "Have read; but am absolutely opposed to the suggested methods."[1]

Thus the legal question remained unsettled, and Vincke, as a stickler for the legal privileges of the estates, considered that the diet ought now to send the king a formal "Declaration of Rights." He obviously had in mind the precedent of the British Bill of Rights, for Dahlmann's *History of the English Revolution* was now in everyone's hands. Prussian conditions, however, had almost nothing in common with those of English history. The British Declaration of Rights was imposed upon a foreign usurper who owed his crown to the revolution, to the will of the British nation, whereas the Prussians were confronted with a legitimate and absolute monarch who had just voluntarily renounced extensive powers. The British were defending ancient rights, which had been frequently exercised,

[1] Knyphausen's Report, April 19, 1847.

and had been repeatedly reacquired through civil war and arduous parliamentary struggle. All that Vincke could appeal to was comprised in the scanty and mutually inconsistent promises of Hardenberg's rough and ready legislation, promises which had never been fulfilled. Thus, whereas the British Declaration of Rights was a historic fact, the attempt to imitate it in Prussia was an utter failure. No unprejudiced person could possibly feel much enthusiasm for so dubious a legal foundation. Even Stüve, a tenacious upholder of strict rights, considered that there was much "hair-splitting and forensic hocus-pocus" in the speeches and writings of the uncompromising Prussian opposition, and he made fun of "the eminent rights which people imagine themselves to possess." [1] In the diet, even Beckerath and Schwerin refused to subscribe the remarkable document, with its enumeration of earlier laws, from which a long series of detached passages was extracted. No more than one hundred and thirty-eight deputies appended their signatures, and nearly three-fourths of them were Rhinelanders or East Prussians. There was thus completely lacking the unanimity which alone can give emphasis to any such protest, and when the curia of peers refused to take part in the discussions, it was found necessary to withdraw the Declaration of Rights as quickly as possible. Vincke had shown for the first time how small was his capacity for the leadership of a party.

Directly the diet turned its attention to business, legal difficulties were manifest at every turn. The members did not know whether they were to regard themselves as constituting the promised territorial representation, and when the government had twice charged the estates to accept certain financial responsibilities, an open struggle occurred. First of all the government had demanded a guarantee from the estates on behalf of the new landrent banks, which were to facilitate the removal of the seigniorial dues. The law was a perfectly reasonable one, and as far as matters of fact were concerned the only objections were raised by the members of a small circle of conservative landowners who feared that the abolition of the dues would be injurious to the privileged landowners. Nor was any danger involved on the financial side, for the landrent charters enjoyed the security of first mortgages. Once more, however, the legal difficulty seemed insuperable.

[1] Op. cit. See vol. V, p. 192.

Vincke declaimed, saying: "How can we consent to burden the country with new obligations, as long as the united diet is not entitled to scrutinise the national finances at regular intervals, and as long as the government can incur debts without our knowledge?" As ill luck would have it, Bodelschwingh, who almost alone (for the other ministers held their tongues and gave him little support) had with admirable patience defended the cause of the crown, now put forward the untenable contention that a guarantee must not be regarded in the same light as a debt. He had said the same thing four years earlier to the united committees, and on that occasion had not aroused any lively contradiction.[1] Since then, however, much attention had been devoted to constitutional questions. It was now generally understood that the estates' right of voting loans would be entirely valueless unless it were to receive a perfectly unambiguous recognition. A fierce attack was consequently made upon the ministers. Many of the deputies manifested as much excitement as if they had been shamefully deceived by the crown, and the legislative proposal was rejected.

Similar struggles, but far more violent and far more momentous, occurred when the government brought forward the bill dealing with the Eastern Railway to Königsberg. Since privately subscribed capital had not been forthcoming, the crown proposed to undertake the gigantic enterprise on its own account,[2] and therefore demanded from the diet guarantees for a loan of from twenty-two to twenty-five and a half million thalers. The need for the railway was beyond dispute. It was positively vital to the depressed economic life of the old Ordensland, and no less vital to the political unification and to the military security of the monarchy, that the turbulent waters of the Vistula, which had hitherto been bridged only at Thorn by a pitiful wooden structure now falling into decay, should at length be subjugated, so that East Prussia might at all seasons have an assured communication with the main body of the state. The preliminary labours had long been in progress. Some years earlier, a brilliant engineer named Lentze had brought forward plans for bridging the Vistula and the Nogat at Dirschau and at Marienburg respectively. Bridges of so tremendous a span were as yet unknown in

[1] See vol. VI, p. 519.
[2] Vide supra, p. 283.

Europe, England not excepted. Long stretches of the railway had to run across the holms at a level eight feet below that of the water in the two streams, and no less than eight thousand navvies were already engaged in building the huge dikes that were requisite. This splendid enterprise, one which could not fail to bring glory to the Prussian name, could be effected without any increase in taxation. The two million thalers which had previously been decreed as an annual subsidy from the state on behalf of railway construction would more than suffice to pay the interest on the loan. Nevertheless, owing to the deplorable posture of the constitutional question, it seemed quite impossible for the diet to vote the loan.

To the great majority of the East Prussians it was a point of pride to convince the country that they were unwilling to sacrifice representative rights in order to secure an advantage for their own province. One of the most respected members of the East Prussian nobility, Saucken-Tarputschen, an old campaigner in the wars of liberation whose inviolable loyalty was well known to the king, solemnly declared: "If by the voting of the loan I could transform all the huts in my native province into palaces, in view of the fact that one whose conscience is easy lives more happily and more comfortably in a hut, than one whose conscience is troubled can live in a palace, I would vote against the proposal." Vincke, in a moving speech, once more defended what he termed "the right," saying: "In the lives of states, situations arise in which the patriot muffles up his head, withdraws into the sanctum of his own mind, and firmly resolves to pay heed to nothing beyond the inner voice which proclaims, "Do right and fear no one!" Hansemann seized the opportunity for an attack upon the war reserve which, to his mercantile mind, seemed far less useful to the state in times of difficulty than would be a good national bank. He proposed that provisionally the crown should use on behalf of the railway a sum not exceeding ten million thalers, to be furnished by the state treasury. He uttered a bold saying which secured universal approval throughout the sensitively responsive business world, and soon became a current catchword: "Sentiment has nothing to do with business."

But were the rights of the matters, concerning which so much emotion was expended, as clear and as precious as people imagined? Was it impossible for the East Prussians, after the

Eastern Railway should have been completed, to continue to sleep with easy consciences in their huts and their palaces—simply because the united diet, though it could reckon with certainty upon being resummoned periodically, had not yet received a formal assurance to that effect, and did not yet possess the right of voting war loans? Were the estates, for the sake of such hair-splittings, to spurn the wellbeing of the country and to reject a law whose passing they in truth desired? Otto von Bismarck, for one, could not allow his actions to be guided by this legalist fanaticism. Amid loud murmurs of dissent from the assembly, he reproached his opponents for wishing "to exercise a right of withholding in addition to the right of voting loans." He asked whether they would not themselves stigmatise it as extortion if the government were to make the conferring of administrative benefits dependent upon the political behaviour of the provinces. The warning of this youthful feudalist, who was universally regarded as nothing more than a hotspur of reaction, was of no avail. The loan was rejected by a majority of two-thirds, although with one exception the whole estate of lords voted in its favour. Since the diet was itself aware of the stupidity of the rejection, it appended the utterly contradictory request that the king would lay before the next diet a fresh proposal concerning the Eastern Railway, and would in the meantime continue the work of construction.

This unfortunate dispute determined the fate of the diet. The king, though he was responsible for all the confusion, came to the conclusion that an understanding with the estates was impossible. How hopefully had he embarked upon this new voyage. Quite recently he had made Cornelius furnish him with a design for a fine medal. Here stood the genius of Prussia, surrounded by the four estates, holding aloft the patent, while the spirit of discontent was flying from the scene. But the king's favourite province was rewarding him for a magnificent act of royal beneficence with a contumelious refusal, and was misleading the other provinces into the paths of disobedience. To these ungrateful folk he could now hardly accord the honoured name of "Prussians" either in speech or in writing. Fierce was his anger when he wrote to Thile on June 8th, saying: "It would be as well that these 'Prussians' should immediately have to contemplate as plainly as possible the punishment for their crazy vote. My will is

that ALL *work on the* VISTULA BRIDGE *and on the railway shall* CEASE FORTHWITH. The rejection of the loan makes me neither cold nor hot. But the 'Prussians' will find that it makes them both cold and hot." General Boyen, too, was incensed at his fellow-countrymen's behaviour, agreeing with the monarch in the following expression of opinion: "*Better would be some momentous act* which would lead the estates TO FOREBODE *other serious and strict proceedings*, than an ineffective answer to the petition delivered *many days after the scandal calling for reply.*" When some of the other ministers pointed out to Frederick William that confidence arouses confidence, whereas acrimony arouses acrimony, he made the angry answer: "NONE of the adduced considerations *apply*. It was my profound conviction that *serious* ACTION (not talk) was here indicated. The only thing for the ailing diet and for the 'Prussians' in specie who were drunken with illegality was to give them a cold douche. Despite their fit of intoxication they had all their wits about them. They must be fought with their own weapons and with the whole power of the state." [1]

The king persisted in carrying out his design. Lentze and his men had solemnly assembled at the works to witness the casting of the first girder, for the operation was to be hailed with the traditional miners' greeting: "Glückauf!" (good luck). At this moment arrived the royal command that all work was to cease. What a miserable affair! For three whole years the bridge-building was interrupted, only the construction of the dikes being continued. To the province which had so recently and so urgently petitioned for the building of the Eastern Railway, the blow was a heavy one, and it soon became plain that among the simple folk of the country districts there was more approval for the eighteen deputies who had voted in favour of the loan than for the sixty-five who had voted against it. Besides, who could understand the over-refined legal scruples which had deprived the Ordensland of such advantages? The conduct of the majority in the diet was neither popular nor generally comprehensible. Frederick William had now lost all confidence in his estates; he no longer read the reports of their proceedings; and at the court festivities he plainly manifested his disfavour towards the members of the opposition. All that he now desired was that

[1] King Ferderick William to Thile, June 8 and 10; Marginal Note to Thile's Memorial of June 10, 1847.

the debates should speedily draw to a close, and to those who had displayed so much ingratitude he would no longer accord the favour of direct converse.

During these brief eleven weeks in which the diet was sitting the proceedings were in other respects of the utmost importance. Whereas the king had hoped that during his lifetime the estates would never exercise their right of voting supply, the expectation was to prove fallacious at this early stage. It was true that no increase in taxation was requisite, but an alteration in the fiscal system seemed desirable, and this needed the approval of the estates. The tax on flour and the tax on beeves, which in the great towns served to replace the graduated income tax, had long been attacked in the journals as oppressive to the poor. The demand was voiced for taxation of the income of the higher classes, and this favourite idea of the Rhenish liberals secured increasing support now that the doctrines of the socialists were being more widely diffused. Unquestionably the evil consequences of the tax on flour and the tax on beeves were universally known. The interference with petty commerce through the collection of taxes at the city gates was a direct encouragement to evasion, and in many towns one offender would be annually discovered per three hundred or even per two hundred of the population. Nevertheless, in this case too the old experience had held good that a tax open to strong objections on theoretical grounds may fail to cause serious grievances in practical life when it has long been enforced and when conditions have become accommodated to it. The poorer classes suffered little or not at all under this much-abused tax. Indeed, the manual workers settled by preference in the towns where the taxes on meal and beeves were levied, seeing that the higher wages paid in these towns were a more than sufficient compensation. Was it certain, moreover, that the prices of bread and meat would sink to any notable extent if the taxes were abolished? Unrestricted competition prevailed in large-scale commerce, but not in the petty trade in the necessaries of life, seeing that people shop as a rule in the immediate neighbourhood of their homes. Were the taxes abolished, the limited number of bakers and butchers in the towns would obviously find it more to their mutual advantage to maintain prices at the old level if they could, instead of endeavouring to undersell one another.

The question was extremely difficult. General Tax Director Kühne, a man of wide experience, was by no means convinced that the reform was absolutely necessary. For political reasons, however, he considered it advisable that the government should anticipate ill-considered proposals from the estates by a suggestion of its own, which, being a concession to liberal public opinion, was sure of a friendly reception, while its failure would not endanger the existing order of the national economy.[1] The suggestion was straightforwardly meant, and secured the king's approval. The government proposed to the diet the abolition of the taxes on meal and beeves. In place of these taxes, the graduated income tax was to be levied for the poorer classes in the towns as well as elsewhere. All incomes exceeding four hundred thalers were to be taxed, but at a very moderate rate, incomes from state loans paying three per cent., and all other incomes paying two per cent. But it soon became apparent that the idea of an income tax, though destined to bear rich fruit in the future, and though this tax had frequently been recommended by the newspapers, was not one to secure as yet general approval. It was opposed by Vincke, Beckerath, Schwerin, and several more of the liberals. Many of the landowners resented the imposition of a new tax, which was to be exacted from them without any compensation; and they complained with considerable justice that the legislation of recent years had been for the most part especially favourable to mobile capital. Peculiarly alarming, however, was the thought of a fiscal inquisition, of the discovery of the economic conditions in every household. In England, it was pointed out, the income tax was extremely unpopular, for no one liked to show his account books to the authorities. Nevertheless, Ludolf Camphausen, the ablest of the Rhenish liberals, a tall, lean man with pinched features and large, severe eyes, made a thoughtful speech in defence of the governmental proposals. A sign of the times was the unprejudiced manner in which this wealthy merchant of Cologne, a man whose customs policy was that of the thorough-going free-traders, did justice to the sound kernel of the new socialistic doctrine. He insisted upon a point which the adherents of the Manchester school in general refused to concede, namely, that the individual man, as a living being, has the right to live, and that society must recognise this right far more exten-

[1] Kühne's Memoirs.

sively than has hitherto been the case. The income tax, he declared, would diminish the burdens of the poorer classes, whilst the necessity for making declarations of income would keep the well-to-do in mind of their social and political duties. The majority, however, would not accept the idea. The diet was content to formulate the vague request that the government would do what it could to reduce the incidence of taxation upon the poorest classes of the population.

The new bill concerning Jewish disabilities aroused more violent opposition. Although Frederick William had little love for the Jews, and although he was incessantly being annoyed by the members of Jacoby's Königsberg circle, he considered it his royal duty to be just to the Jews as to his other subjects. He determined that the edict of emancipation promulgated on March 11, 1812, during the Hardenberg regime, a measure which did not go very far, and which had hitherto been enforced only in the old provinces (for it had been rejected by the other provincial diets as unduly liberal),[1] should with certain modifications now become applicable throughout Prussia. Unfortunately, his fondness for caste divisions led him astray. His idea was to treat the Jews as constituting distinct corporations, an utterly impracticable notion, for the cultured and Germanised members of the Jewish community were far from desiring to be regarded as an independent nation apart from their German fellow-citizens. Were this defect eliminated, it was undeniable that in most of the new provinces the measure would bring notable alleviations to the Jews. It prescribed for the future complete equality of civic rights and duties, except that representative rights, access to certain governmental positions, and access to some of the teaching posts, were still denied them.

The Jews in Prussia, considered as a body, were of very mixed composition. Many of them were engaged in business avocations, upon a large scale or upon a small, and a number of these were most estimable persons. Next came the motley crowd of professors, medical practitioners, and men of letters, who were all respectable, though some of them made themselves a nuisance to the authorities by their radical views. Finally there had to be considered a rabble rout containing perhaps a few honest but impoverished individuals, but consisting for the most part of the hordes of usurers and land speculators,

[1] See vol. IV, pp. 152 to 155.

old-clothesmen and horse-dealers, keepers of liquor shops and brothels, go-betweens and marriage-brokers, hawkers and beggars, receivers and thieves; German thieves' slang was full of words of Hebrew origin. This fermenting mass of Jewry was found above all in the grand duchy of Posen, for here there had occurred a precipitation of all the filth in Polish history. There was nothing German about these people with their stinking caftans and their obligatory lovelocks, except their detestable mongrel speech. The Prussian state, therefore, had from the first issued special laws applying to the Jews of Posen, and recently (1833) had established a formal distinction between "naturalised Jews" and "protected Jews." The protected Jew was unable to acquire civil rights in the communes, and was forbidden to remove to another province. If, however, he was engaged in some honest urban occupation, or if he tilled a small piece of land, or if he had done his military service satisfactorily, or, finally, if he could merely secure a testimonial from the local authorities, it was easy for him to acquire naturalisation, thus gaining all the rights of the Jews in the old provinces. The results of this ordinance, promulgated at the suggestion of Flottwell, the liberal lord lieutenant, had been most beneficial. The more desirable members of the Jewish community in Posen endeavoured to adapt themselves to German ways and to engage in some regular occupation in order to become naturalised. If this wholesome restriction were to be enforced for a further term of years, there was some reason to hope that Jewish migration to Berlin and the adjoining provinces, which it would be impossible to avert in the long run, might to some extent be regulated, so that it would not become a positive curse to the country. A sudden removal of the disabilities was inadvisable if only for the reason that the Jews from Russian Poland, who were yet more degraded than those of Posen, were eagerly thronging into Prussia, from which their exclusion was difficult. Moreover, the refusal to allow a Jew to occupy a high office of state was unquestionably in conformity with the general wishes of our population, for authority cannot be properly exercised except by one who possesses prestige and inspires confidence, whereas nothing would have induced the peasants to believe in the justice of a Jewish judge.

As far as the higher classes were concerned, there had of late been a notable change in opinion. Twenty years earlier

a definite hostility towards the idea of equal rights for the Jews had been displayed, not only by the Christo-Germanic Burschenschafters and by the conservative provincial diet of East and West Prussia, but also by the South German liberals. As late as the year after the July revolution, Paulus, leader of the liberal rationalists, published a trenchant writing animadverting upon *Jewish National Isolation.* Rotteck, Welcker, and their friends in the Badenese chamber, were at that time likewise opposed to granting entire equality of rights to the Jews, although the reluctance many of them displayed was doubtless a mere reflex of the reluctance of the electorate. By degrees, however, the abstract French doctrine of equal citizenship had made its way into Germany. The Jewish journalists busily diffused it, and made an adroit use of the telling new catchword "the emancipation of the Jews," although, as far at least as the Old Prussian provinces was concerned, there was no ground whatever for talking of Israelite bondage. Electoral Hesse was the first German territory in which the Jews secured absolute equality of rights (1833). The prince regent, being so intimate with Amschel Rothschild, could not venture to resist the demands of the liberal diet. The results of this first experiment were most unsatisfactory. It was made plain that the sins of usury and cheating were not merely the consequences of lack of freedom, but were deeply inracinated national failings of the Jews, vices whose extirpation would be far from easy. In Hesse, where the Jews could now adopt any profession they chose, they showed themselves to be cruel bloodsuckers upon the poor countryfolk, with the result that the cradle of Jewish emancipation in Germany soon became the focus of an utterly fanatical hatred of the Jews. None the less, the breeze from the west continued to blow, so that French law came to be widely regarded as reason incorporated in the written word. Milde, a wealthy Breslau manufacturer who had lived in France and England and was an honest champion of the cause of the new liberal bourgeoisie, demanded in the united diet that, with trifling alterations, the *code Napoléon* should be introduced throughout Prussia.

The hostility towards the church which animated the radical poets and philosophers contributed yet further to promote the realisation of the wishes of the Jews. Contempt for all religious sentiment was already regarded as characteristic

of a powerful intelligence, and many liberal Protestants were prepared to accept the extraordinary idea that Protestantism is more akin to Judaism than to the Catholic church, for to such Protestants the very essence of their faith seemed to consist in the struggle against Rome. The defenders of the emancipation of the Jews made a gross misuse of the great name of Lessing. The beautiful fable of the three rings (whose profound irony can be readily recognised, seeing that only one of the rings is genuine) was thoughtlessly interpreted as if Lessing had been as dull-witted as his expounders, as if he had intended to place Islam, a religion spread by violence, or Judaism, which has long since been shrivelled to a mummy, on an equal footing with the religion of love and liberty. In the capital, since the campaign of the enlightened friends there had prevailed almost unopposed that self-satisfied enlightenment which long ago in the days of Nicolai had found expression in the typically Berlinese couplet :

> That God exists, taught Moses long ago ;
> The proof of this to Moses Mendelssohn we owe.

Humboldt and his associates, who had an unconditional veneration of the French revolution, could see nothing but religious intolerance and black barbarism in any restriction in the political rights of the Jews. Unfortunately the great traveller knew far less of his own fatherland than he knew of Mexico or Siberia. He overlooked the fact that in proportion to population there were at least eight times as many Jews in Prussia as in France. He overlooked also that the Prussian Jews were mostly of Polish origin, whereas at that time the majority of French Jews belonged to the Spanish branch of Jewry, which was more highly cultured than the Polish and more akin to western civilisation. Being himself a cosmopolitan rather than a German, Humboldt overlooked, in addition, the most important consideration of all, that the Germans lacked that fine instinctive national pride whereby in France all people of foreign stock were unconditionally compelled to conform to the national civilisation.

The Jews of Germany had meanwhile secured a sturdy and eloquent champion in Gabriel Riesser, the Hamburg lawyer, a staunch patriot, of whom his friends boasted that law had become a very part of him. It was to him a matter of the

first importance to promote the cause of equal rights for the Jews. Since the early thirties he had been advocating this cause, often intemperately but always straightforwardly, in his periodical *Der Jude* and in numerous pamphlets. Though himself a moderate liberal, he took the bull by the horns, and made the Badenese liberals one of his chief targets. He knew perfectly well that his co-religionists could not expect to secure equal rights unless they became thoroughly Germanised; but since, as far as he himself was concerned, he felt German to the core, as did his friend Moritz Veit of Berlin and the cultured Jews of his own immediate circle, he did not hesitate to maintain that the German Jews had long since renounced their erstwhile nationality. This was the weak spot in his case, for he assumed the very point that had to be proved. Had all German Jews been animated with sentiments resembling those of this enthusiastic patriot, there would never, among our broad-minded people, have been any opposition to their receiving equal rights.

The proceedings of the diet in this affair were affected, as still happens to-day whenever a dispute arises upon the Jewish question, by obscurity as to the legal issues involved. In point of law, those only were Jews who professed the Mosaic religion, and consequently those who objected to the granting of equal rights to the Jews were liable to convey a false impression, and to make people suppose that they wished to limit religious toleration, the old glory of Prussia. Yet Prussian legislation dealing with the Jews had for a century and a half been exclusively guided by secular considerations. Not by religious scruples had the royal freethinker Frederick been induced to erase the name of Moses Mendelssohn from the list of candidates for the academy. Whilst the state, at the time with which we are now dealing, was willing to naturalise the protected Jews of Posen upon certain conditions only, it did not demand from those who applied for naturalisation any repudiation of particular religious views, but merely insisted that they must gain their livelihood in some honest occupation, and that they must not absolutely eschew the laborious duties of personal cleanliness. The state authorities assumed, and were for the most part right in assuming, that any Jew who submitted to baptism was by that very fact announcing his intention of becoming in all respects a German. They believed that this foreign stock, which was still unquestionably detested by

the mass of the German nation, had not hitherto been sufficiently Germanised in its manners and customs. For this reason it was considered premature to place Christian Germans under the orders of Jewish officials. The whole dispute centred in reality round this purely political question. The law, however, could not regard the Jews in any other light than as a religious community; for no other legal distinction could, without arbitrariness, be drawn between Germans and Jews. The defenders of the extant law therefore based their advocacy upon the doctrine of the Christian state, and however brilliantly this doctrine had recently been expounded in Stahl's writings, the argument could not fail to introduce further confusion into the legal concepts bearing on the matter. For, while it was quite indisputable that the Germans were a Christian nation and that their whole life, and therewith consequently their legal system, were permeated with the Christian spirit, it was equally undeniable that the German state was a secular organisation which existed for the pursuit of its own secular aims, and which on principle left all religious activities in the hands of the churches. Apart from this, Christianity had legal existence solely in the form of definite creeds, of circumscribed churches, and since Prussia, being a parity state, knew nothing of a state church, the defenders of the Christian state lost themselves in a maze of ill-defined general contentions, to which the opposition party replied with equally vague generalities concerning the rights and the dignity of man. All kinds of odious subsidiary considerations were introduced into the controversy. Modern society was by now so interpenetrated with Jewry, that it had long ceased to be possible to keep a discussion of the Jewish question upon the plane of unemotional fact. It was a matter of common notoriety in good society that many of the landowners in the diet were heavily indebted to the Jews, but that they were unwilling to acknowledge their dependence upon the Berlin bankers, who were busily at work behind the scenes.[1]

The upshot was that, in the lengthy discussions of the bill concerning Jewish disabilities, few fruitful ideas came to light. In the name of Christianity, Beckerath uttered an unctuous exhortation: "Let us not exclude from the circle of human rights anyone upon whose forehead God has impressed the imperishable seal of his likeness!" Yet no one contested

[1] Knyphausen's Report, May 21; Platen's Report, June 13, 1847.

the human rights of the Jews, but only their right to fill offices of state among a Christian people. No less unfortunate were the words used by Minister Thile, habitually taciturn, when he at length opened his lips in a speech resembling a sermon. He opined that the Jew could never become a German or a Prussian, seeing that the Jews' fatherland was Sion—a contention that could apply only to the very small minority of Israelites of strict faith. Nor did Eichhorn prove an effective speaker when he defended the idea of the Christian state. Next came Vincke, who emptied the vials of his scorn upon this Christian doctrine in a brilliant but extremely injudicious speech whose aim seemed to be to affront the most sacred sentiments of the pious king, whilst in essence it contained nothing but empty witticisms. Amid roars of laughter, Vincke declared: "A Christian state is an utter impossibility, for the Bible tells us, 'Thou shalt not kill.'" The jester seemed completely ignorant of the fact that this same Bible makes the gravest references to the necessity for war and executions. With typical Sarmatian arrogance, Jaraczewski now recommended the emancipation of the Jews, so that his homeland Posen might be disburdened from its excess of Israelities. Hoping to appease his patient German neighbours he said consolingly: "The Jews resemble water, which when stagnant is apt to produce marshes and to poison the country, whereas it displays all its beneficent qualities when it is guided so as to flow freely through the meadows."

The cheerful prophecies of this Polish orator were far more agreeable to the liberal majority than were the warnings of Thadden-Trieglaff, the Pomeranian, who, in sharp contrast with the previous speaker, demanded "the emancipation of the Christians from the Jews," and regarded as peculiarly dangerous the activities of Jewish teachers in Christian schools. Thadden was one of those originals who make their appearance at times amid the stimulated emotional life of such communities as the "awakened" and other pietists. A devout warrior who had fought in the wars of liberation, sincerely religious, positively childlike in the purity of his life, charitable to the pitch of extravagance, he was anything but a hypocrite, being serene, merry, well-read, afraid of nobody, and therefore ever ready to permit absolute outspokenness to the opponents of his ultra-legitimist views. Those intimately acquainted with the patriarch of Further Pomerania could not fail to regard

him with affection, but the liberals looked upon him as nothing better than a fool.

Not much higher was the liberal estimate of Thadden's youthful favourite Bismarck, who likewise championed at this juncture the doctrines of the Christian state. With the frankness of genius, Bismarck admitted that he was under the sway of the spontaneous sentiment which indubitably prevailed throughout the mass of the German country-folk, saying: "I should feel utterly depressed and dejected if I could imagine that a Jew could act as representative of the king's sacred majesty." He spoke next in the sonorous tones of German pride. Beckerath, in his elegiac manner, had referred to a Jewish youth who had fallen in the War of Liberation, and whose life had been fruitlessly spilled, since the Jews were still unable to hold ministerial positions. Bismarck fulminated against this thin sentimentality, saying: "I cannot believe that blood has flowed in vain when it has been shed for German freedom, and hitherto German freedom has not been so lowly esteemed as not to be worth dying for even though the emancipation of the Jews were not therewith secured." He refused to regard such a death as a great sacrifice, and he expressed the wish that the Germans should be inspired with "the proud feeling of national honour" which made it impossible for the English and the French to model their laws upon any foreign example.

In later speeches he returned persistently to these ideas. Nothing enraged him more than the liberal fable that the Prussians had fought the War of Liberation for the sake of the longed-for constitution. On behalf of this war, he fiercely rejoined, our people required "no other reason than the disgrace that foreigners were ruling our land." Anyone who denied this, he said, was "doing an ill turn to the national honour." When the liberals attempted to snub the young man by referring to the fact that the wars of liberation had been outside the range of his personal experience, he rejoined with that mighty self-confidence which his future actions were to justify: "I have always believed that the servitude against which Germany was then fighting had its source in a foreign land. I have just learned that it was a domestic product, and I am anything but grateful for the enlightenment." There was an abundance of oratorical talent in the assembly, and many previous speakers had alluded both nobly and cordially

to the power and unity of the fatherland, but none prior to this decried Brandenburg junker had with such boldness, self-confidence, and Teutonic defiance declaimed "*Deutschland über alles!*" [Germany before all!] This was the voice of the man who in time to come was to complete the work of the Hohenstaufens and the Hohenzollerns.

The curia of the three estates demanded certain additional enlargements of Jewish rights, actually desiring that the Jews of Posen should immediately be placed upon an equal footing with the Jews elsewhere. Since, however, the curia of peers rejected this frivolous demand, the peculiar position of the Posen Jews (which was advantageous to all parties) was maintained, and on July 23, 1847, the new law concerning Jewish disabilities was promulgated, mainly in accordance with the proposals of the government, the only important change being that the unlucky idea of establishing Jewish corporations was dropped. A comparison with the conditions that prevailed in neighbouring German states could not fail to reveal how gentle and just was the spirit of the law. In Saxony, the Jews were permitted to reside in either of two towns only; in Mecklenburg, there were many places where they were not allowed to stay even for a night. But no gratitude was forthcoming, and the magnanimous concession served only to awaken a desire for more. The liberal press clamoured, demanding the liberties that had been granted in Electoral Hesse, and it could already be foreseen that the ideas of the *code Napoléon* were destined sooner or later to gain the victory.

The Poles, too, demanded from the estates the maintenance of their nationality and their language. But in the united diet the very men who in their own provincial diet had so often railed in the most undisciplined manner, now displayed remarkable modesty, and in the curia of peers Prince Radziwill was actually looked upon as an ardent supporter of the government. This moderation was shrewdly calculated, for the great Polish trial was about to begin, and the Polish deputies dreaded lest any manifestation of their true sentiments might prejudice the fate of their accused fellow-countrymen. Despite the audacious rising of the previous year, the liberals displayed a weakly sentimental favour towards the Poles. Vincke again spoke with much eloquence, and was once more extremely injudicious, showing no knowledge of the matter under consideration. He recommended the government to show forbearance, in order

that the Poles might "feel themselves to be thoroughly German and Prussian"—a feeling which was utterly foreign to the Poles' own outlook. Great was the shame inflicted upon this German cosmopolitanism when Wodiczka, a Pole from Upper Silesia, solemnly repudiated any community of sentiment with the malcontents of Posen. "The Poles," he exclaimed, "do not look upon us as brothers." In actual fact, the Silesian Poles, who were sharply distinguished from their Sarmatian neighbours by their history, their customs, and their dialect, were entirely loyal to the crown of Prussia. "We Upper Silesians," said Wodiczka in conclusion, "desire to be looked upon and treated only as German brothers, as Prussians." The estates received the Poseners' petition, notwithstanding the fact that, by the terms of the patent the united diet had no concern with provincial troubles. Six years of common struggle with the government had brought the provincial diets into closer contact; the pride of the men of the old German march was being overpowered by the party spirit; even in East Prussia it was now becoming a point of honour among the liberals to favour the liberal Poles. The king, who could take nothing amiss from his Poles, had a gracious intimation conveyed to the petitioners that they must address their request to the proper quarter, either to their own provincial diet or else directly to the throne; it would then receive sympathetic attention. Subsequently the sarmatiophil enthusiasm of the majority led to the adoption of a most unseemly resolution. The king was begged in advance "to show all possible clemency" towards the arrested Polish conspirators, although it remained for the imminent trial to show how gravely these rebels had offended against the clemency of the government. A debate was expressly avoided, for the liberals' delicacy made them wish to spare the feelings of the Polish deputies, whose friends and relatives were in prison.

In many other cases, as in this one, the petty prescriptions of the standing orders were ignored. The king had long been on the precipitous slope concernng which Metternich had issued so many warnings. Such a diet, one containing so many members and such a number of men of talent, one so profoundly influenced by the ideas of a time of upheaval, was positively compelled to encroach, had perforce to attempt the discussion of everything that might bring weal or woe to the fatherland. By the terms of the patent, the estates were to confine their

attention to home affairs. But the annexation of Cracow and the long-continued interruption of commerce with revolutionary Spain had been injurious to several of the provinces, and especially to Silesia. How could these territorial troubles be discussed without trenching upon European politics? Minister Canitz could not but recognise this, and he assured the estates that a tactful debate upon foreign affairs would not be prohibited. Little did he foresee the effect of his thoughtless words! There was general rejoicing, for it was assumed that the crown was voluntarily conceding a new right to the diet. Even Rochow-Stülpe, marshal of the curia of the three estates, shared this opinion. In the constitutional committee he had shortly before obstinately opposed all the king's plans for a representative assembly. Despite this he had been appointed marshal of the diet, and with marked self-renunciation he did his utmost to fill the difficult office in a non-partisan spirit. He declared that whereas heretofore he had disallowed as out of order all petitions dealing with foreign politics, he would now accept such petitions.

The court and the entire conservative camp displayed an excitement which was readily comprehensible. The prince of Prussia besieged his royal brother with the most urgent representations. In any case he was no friend to the sarcastic Canitz, and he was entirely immersed in thoughts of Prussia's destiny as a great power. What would happen, he asked himself, if this diet, whose functions were purely deliberative, and which therefore had no responsibility for its actions, were to be entitled at any moment to disturb the European policy of the crown by frivolous petitions? The old Guelph ruler, who had a grudge against the Prussian minister from the days when, as Hanoverian envoy, Canitz had opposed the Hanoverian coup d'état, wrote maliciously: "I was quite right in thinking Canitz a fool."[1] At the court of Berlin it was openly declared that Canitz ought to be hanged with the very rope which he had wound by making his speech. King Frederick William was unwilling to dismiss a minister whom he regarded as particularly valuable; moreover, he himself felt that it would be impossible to exclude from the diet all discussion of foreign affairs. But as long as he had not thought fit in his royal wisdom to suggest any change, the estates were not to take a single step beyond the allotted privileges. On

[1] Knyphausen's Report, May 22, 1847, with Marginal Note by King Ernest Augustus.

May 20th, therefore, he declared that the speech of the marshal of the diet had been "disastrous," and he added: "Since it is opposed to my law of February 3rd, it must be amended coûte que coûte." [1] After a great ministerial council, Canitz was compelled to give to the diet a much modified and restricted interpretation of his previous speech. But the sluices had been opened. It had become impossible to forbid violent attacks upon the Germanic Federation and passionate complaints concerning the disintegration of the fatherland. A petition for the maintenance of German rights in Schleswig-Holstein was formally referred to a committee. The report of this committee was not ready until the last moment, when the session of the diet was about to be closed; then Count Schwerin suddenly rose to his feet and upon his own initiative read to the assembly the committee's report, which ardently advocated the rights of North Albingia. The assembly passed the report by acclamation, and although the marshal of the diet subsequently censured the procedure as illegal, it was impossible for him to undo the fact that the demonstration had been made.

No one could prevent the long-suppressed wishes of an impatient era from finding voice in the diet. The estates demanded publicity for the debates of the town councils, and the crown found it expedient to issue the cabinet order of July 23, 1847, wherein the demand was conceded. Upon Auerswald's motion they unanimously voted a request for freedom of the press. A debate was regarded as superfluous, for all parties were agreed as to the impracticability of the censorship. On this occasion Thadden-Trieglaff published an indignant speech which culminated in the sentence: "Freedom of the press, but side by side with it the gallows." Despite its paradoxical form, the speech contained a number of sound ideas, and secured the approval of the prince of Prussia. The candid eccentric saw the day approaching when men would no longer believe in God but would believe in the newspaper. He recognised as a danger common to all democratic epochs the danger of moral cowardice, which manifests itself in the dread of personal responsibility and in the demand for secret ballots and journalistic anonymity. He therefore asked for the abolition of the censorship, severe punishment of breaches of the press law, and the signing of all articles. Journalistic anonymity

[1] King Frederick William to Thile, May 20, 1847.

had, however, long since become intimately associated with the customs of modern life. Thadden's speech merely served as a target for mockery; and were it only for the challenge of its main proposition it quite undeservedly acquired a proverbial reputation as a masterpiece of reactionary folly. To the demand for freedom of the press the representatives of the crown had no other answer to make than that the Bundestag must first modify its press law.

The government was likewise obviously embarrassed when, from the tribune, Hansemann, with an air of raillery, showed the diet, first the thin folios of the Prussian survey of national expenditure, and subsequently the thick tomes of the Belgian, the French, and the Danish budget. Bodelschwingh answered with perfect truth: "We have nothing to conceal. Whereas in constitutionalist France the secret funds run into millions, in Prussia they amount to no more than seventeen thousand thalers." But this financial administration, so thrifty and so scrupulously honest, had at the late king's command paid 473,000 thalers to Don Carlos, and what was to prevent something similar or even something worse in the future? It had now become impossible to refuse the estates permission to undertake a thorough and precise examination of the national finances; they were absolutely entitled to this if they were to vote taxes and loans. Though petitions and proposals of every kind were pouring in to the diet, the opposition prudently resolved to avoid anything which might cause a split in its ranks. Strong language was used regarding the treatment of dissenters, but not a word was uttered as to the relationships between the state and the Roman Catholic church, for the liberals from the east were anxious not to offend their Rhenish colleagues. The miseries of the Silesian weavers came up for discussion, and the prince of Prussia, Prince Lichnowsky, and other members of the curia of peers, warmly advocated an increase in the duties on yarn; but a formal debate upon the general principles of customs policy was sedulously avoided, for some of the Silesian and of the Rhenish liberals were protectionists, while their friends from the coastal regions were one and all free-traders.

During the closing weeks of the session the discussions turned chiefly upon proposals for a modification in the law of February 3rd, a matter which had long been under consideration. To many of the liberals, this enlargement of representative

rights seemed the main function of the diet, and the signatories of the shipwrecked Declaration of Rights now endeavoured to reach port by another course. The government's position was one of extreme difficulty, owing to the lack of any firm legal standing-ground. Savigny had to learn that the great academic orator can by no means count upon parliamentary success. He convinced no one when he endeavoured to prove that the earlier laws did not pledge the king to summon the assembly at regular intervals. When the ministers went on to maintain that the crown had not taken over any guarantee for the Prussian bank, they involved themselves in hopeless contradictions. An indignant deputy produced a bank-note, on which was inscribed, plain for everyone to read, that it must be accepted by all the authorities in lieu of hard cash, and the king, wishing to tranquillise his loyal estates, found it necessary to confirm the assurance once again. The opposition, however, moved in a circle in its repeated declarations that the obscure promises of Hardenberg's laws conveyed indisputable rights. "As high as heaven is placed above the earth, so high," said Vincke, "does right stand above expediency. Let it be possible for unbiased historians to write in future days: The first diet of the crown of Prussia, and above all the members of the curia of the three estates, the Ritterschaft, the towns, and the rural communes, were true and diligent cultivators of the field of right, and never diverged a foot from this area; not by the span of a finger-nail did they yield ground; invariably and stubbornly did they cling to the ancient principle of our German fathers, Right is Right!" These words secured loud applause, but failed to win over opponents.

It was all fruitless logomachy; loyal patriots were pulled this way and that. Yet it would have been so easy for the king to prevent the rancorous and embittering dispute if he had but drafted his patent in unambiguous and legally unimpeachable terms. Even Bismarck did not question the necessity for summoning the diet at regular intervals. In default of this, the assembly had no assured existence, and a free rein would be given to the malicious reports which were universally current. The omniscient Berliners had long been insisting that the diet was nothing more than a "pumping station" for the needy crown, and would not be resummoned until the state of the finances made the step again requisite. The king had however promised that the united diet should reassemble

within four years. Everyone foresaw that the summons would necessarily be issued in considerably less than four years, whilst in the interim the united committees would meet at regular intervals. In view of these facts, was it prudent to attempt to force the king's hand, to demand a formal alteration in the laws that had just been promulgated? Perspicacious men might well differ upon such a question. To the great wrath of the liberals, Bismarck declared that he could not consider the opinion of the Prussian people to be represented by the meetings held at the Königsberg Böttcherschöfchen. His advice was that the grass of one summer at least should be allowed to grow over the dispute before fresh demands were made. The curia of peers, seeing that the legal position was so obscure, did not wish to send in a protest, but merely to petition the king. The members of the curia were anything but narrow-minded. Princes Wied, Lichnowsky, and Lynar, and Counts Dyhrn, York, and Zieten, declared in plain terms that Prussia's estate of peers must never follow the example of the misguided Bourbon nobility. But most of the members of the curia of peers were influenced in their views by the prestige of the prince of Prussia, who once more, regardless of calumnious gossip, fought in the cause of his royal brother. Again and again he urged confidence in the monarch, saying: "If there could ever be a king of Prussia who should arbitrarily attempt to interfere with the rights of the estates, I am entitled, I believe, to say with pride that such a king would be unworthy of his ancestors. I trust I am able to give the assurance that I shall impress these sentiments upon my son and shall hand them down to him. Should God so please, this will continue from generation to generation." As always, his thoughts turned to what his son would do; he had absolutely no inkling of his own future.

After protracted discussions, the more acrimonious suggestions were dropped, and the four curias agreed upon sending in a very modest petition. They besought the king to summon the diet at regular intervals, and, in view of this regular assembly, to restrict the sphere of activities of the united committees. Finally they begged, "in consideration of earlier legislation, and on grounds of expediency and inner necessity," that the election of the committees should for the present be postponed. A sultry atmosphere prevailed in the house, and during the last court festival at Sans-Souci, Thadden-Trieglaff

thought forebodingly of the song: "Ô Richard! ô mon roi! l'univers t'abandonne." The king's refusal was not wholly ungracious, although in the interim the diet had angered him greatly by its untoward decision concerning the Eastern Railway. In his secret heart, Frederick William had long been aware that the periodic summoning of the united diet had now become inevitable. First, however, everything he had commanded in the ordinances of February 3rd must be dutifully carried out. Only when this had been done would he be free, unharassed, to decide in accordance with his royal wisdom. He therefore promised "to give careful consideration" to the proposals for the periodic summoning of the diet and for the restrictions of the functions of the committees. But the committees were to be reelected forthwith, for he wished to lay before them without delay the draft of the new criminal code, which had long been in course of preparation.

This royal message was issued on June 24th. The diet was to be prorogued within two days, the king having meanwhile left Berlin in high dudgeon. It was now necessary to come to a speedy decision whether the election was to take place, and the session ended as it had begun in a barren struggle concerning legal subtleties. No one now doubted that the united committees were artificial and futile constructions, but, having been created six years before by the absolute crown, they unquestionably continued to exist de jure. The diet had never contested the point, and it was therefore incumbent upon the diet to proceed with the new election. The contention that the rights of the diet would be restricted if a committee elected by itself were to give an unauthoritative opinion upon the criminal code, was one of a hair-splitting character, and could only be based upon strained legal considerations utterly incomprehensible to the general public. Since everyone knew that the king was disposed within the near future to agree to the summoning of the diet at regular intervals, respect for monarchical institutions suggested that he ought not to be embittered by mulish obstinacy. Moreover, if the opposition would not take part in the election, it would deliberately exclude itself from the united committees.

None of these obvious political considerations had any weight with the irrepressible "deputy of County Mark." In the stormy preliminary discussion, Vincke bluntly demanded abstention from the election. This was what he termed "right."

To him the only matter of moment was a reputation for perfect consistency, a virtue for which practical statesmen who think of the fatherland before themselves have ever had but little esteem. In this instance, however, his East Prussian friends refused to follow his lead, though they had shown clearly enough in the past that they were inclined to make the most of legalist considerations. They unanimously declared their intention to participate in the election, without prejudice to the rights of the diet. In the end, only fifty-eight deputies abstained; among these were twenty-eight Rhinelanders, with Hansemann, Mevissen, and their supporters, but not a single member of the estate of peers. One hundred and fifty-seven of the deputies participated with various reserves, none of which had any legal importance; two hundred and eighty-four voted unconditionally. The attempt to renew the Declaration of Rights thus proved a lamentable failure, and Vincke had once again led his party to defeat. Nevertheless this much-contested election left a painful impression. The deputies parted, not indeed as positive enemies, but inspired with the distressing recognition that precious energies had been expended almost in vain. Bodelschwingh, in closing the session, was greatly moved when he said: "The activities of the united diet have been less fruitful for the country than might have been anticipated." Among the people, the brilliant speakers of the diet had aroused great admiration. Contrasted with them, the dreaded officialdom, of which Bodelschwingh and a few of the more vigorous among the governmental commissaries, such as Kühne, had been the only efficient representatives, had made a poor showing, appearing much weaker than it really was. Nevertheless, these proceedings, which, however brilliant, had been so strangely confused, could not possibly awaken any strong and definite sentiment, whether of aversion or approval. Even loyal subjects of the king no longer knew where they stood, and such aimless discontent has ever been the breeding-ground of revolution. For the production of this dangerous mood no one could bear a heavier responsibility than the monarch, whose paternal aim it had been to keep the nation in leading strings and to compel it to support him in his incomprehensible designs.

Frederick William's displeasure was increased to the uttermost by the closing proceedings of the diet. He seriously considered the possibility of unseating all the deputies who had

abstained from the election, or of having them punished for contumacy. The lords lieutenant of the malcontent provinces, however, one and all made urgent representations to the effect that such measures would serve only to heighten the ill-feeling, and the design was consequently abandoned.[1] The king had better grounds for his anger in the case of the Landrats, Vincke, Bockum-Dolffs, Bardeleben, and Platen, who had played prominent parts among the liberals. As soon as parliamentary representation began in real earnest, it was essential that the parliamentary position of those deputies who happened to be government officials should be clearly defined. Vincke was Bodelschwingh's subordinate, and his action as leader of an irreconcilable opposition, one which contested the minister's entire legal outlook, was hardly compatible with the discipline of an orderly administration. By royal command, therefore, the four Landrats were asked whether they regarded the laws of February 3rd as legally binding, and whether they would conform to these laws in the performance of their official duties. All four of them undertook to carry out the laws concerning representative institutions in so far as their consciences permitted; Vincke added that, in case of need, he would hand in his resignation in good time. This pledge sufficed to indicate that the legal ground assumed by the opposition did not appear absolutely defensible even to these leaders of the defence. The ministers now advised that no further measures should be taken, seeing that the Landrats could not be punished for their conduct at the diet nor yet for their opinions. The king allowed himself to be persuaded, but he commanded Vincke to reconsider the position saying: "In view of his good qualities in other respects, and in view of my peculiar regard for his deceased father, it would give me redoubled pleasure to learn that he had abandoned his erroneous views." Bardeleben, too, whose answer had had a somewhat vague ring, received a special warning. "I will give him an opportunity," wrote the king, "to regain my waning respect and my *completely* lost confidence."[2] Thus gently, far more gently than would have been possible to a constitutional government, did the absolute crown deal with

[1] Reports to Bodelschwingh: from Lord Lieutenant Wedell, July 17; from Lord Lieutenant Eichmann, July 8; from Lord Lieutenant Bötticher, August 5, 1847.

[2] Cabinet Order to the ministry of state, July 24; Report of the ministry of state, December 10, 1847; Cabinet Order to the ministry of state, January 4, 1848.

its officials. Yet it is true that the sagacious fatherliness of such exhortations may well have been more mortifying to men of proud spirit than any punishment would have been.

His anger notwithstanding, Frederick William was far from feeling that he had sustained a defeat. In his view, no subject could gain a victory over him. On the contrary, he continued to believe that the future of his constitutional work was still completely in his royal hand. He considered that in the king's speech he had expressed himself in a manner which was not open to any possibility of misunderstanding. He wrote therefore to Bunsen: "To epitomise the extremely long speech, which was extemporised, not read, what I said was: One would be a sevenfold blockhead—1, to demand a constitution, and 2, a still greater blockhead to grant a constitution—when there is one already. Hence the brief reference to England. Mon chancelier vous dira le reste." [1] To help himself to forget his momentary annoyance, he gave himself up to his restless love of travel. He went first to Breslau, where Kiss's equestrian statue of the Great King was unveiled; thence to Pillnitz to meet his beloved brother-in-law, Prince John of Saxony. In truth there could be no return of the merry days when Crown Prince "Dicky" and his "Carissimo Sasso di Dante" had eaten goodies here on the shores of the Elbe.[2] Nevertheless, the king's equanimity was restored, and it was a delight to him to receive while at Pillnitz an address of gratitude signed by about forty members of the Brandenburg Ritterschaft, an address which he hastened to have published.[3] Next he went to Ischl, where his consort was staying to restore her health; subsequently to Trieste and Venice; and then back to the Rhine. There he enjoyed another day of great happiness when, in the quiet wooded vale of Altenberg, he reopened for divine service the beautiful abbey church of the counts of Berg, which had recently been restored, thus magnanimously fulfilling a national wish of old date, to which Goethe, Schinkel, Arndt, Harkort, and many other distinguished men had given expression.

Whilst the king was thus doing his utmost to forget his ill-humour, his intimate friends were much distressed at the

[1] King Frederick William to Bunsen, April 13, 1847.

[2] Crown Prince Frederick William to Prince John of Saxony, Dresden, April 29, 1833.

[3] King Frederick William to Thile, Pillnitz, July 17, 1847.

failure of his parliamentary enterprise. No one was more keenly disappointed than the faithful Radowitz. He had followed the proceedings of the diet with close attention, and from a distance had occasionally contributed to the debates "an undelivered speech." Before the close of the session he had come to realise that, as he expressed it, "this disaffected and untrustful generation is incapable of understanding its king's words." On June 13th he wrote straightforwardly as follows: "I have devoted my life to historical studies, and have never come across the account of any other ruler who has occupied a mighty throne with so admirable a combination of heart and intelligence, nor one so uncontaminated by false political doctrine, nor one so earnest and so joyful in his laborious mission. Had your royal majesty become the chosen man of your people and of the German nation . . . the foundation would have been firmly established upon which the structure of the truly representative monarchy would have been erected. . . . This has not come to pass. Seven years have fled, never to return. I am profoundly concerned and grieved to know that, because the possible was not attempted, the impossible is now being undertaken." [1] He foresaw the coming crash, and the mood throughout the country was unquestionably menacing. The diet broke up quietly enough. Another opposition banquet was held. Addresses were read from the Swabian liberals and from the staunch men of Danzig. Due homage was paid to the hundred and thirty-eight deputies who had signed the Declaration of Rights, and whose names had been omitted by the king from the list of invitations to his last court festivals. Prince Lichnowsky loudly acclaimed the harmony of the four curias. Vincke drank to the health of the East Prussians, with whose help he could not dispense in the future, although they had left him in the lurch in the matter of the committee elections. A few only of the deputies were welcomed with pomp and ceremony when they returned to their homes, for the celebrated legal questions with which the diet had been mainly occupied were beyond the comprehension of the people.

Meanwhile there were many indications that discontent was on the increase. The language used in the press by the disappointed Jews became bolder day by day. The grateful address from the Brandenburg Ritterschaft was speedily followed

[1] Radowitz to King Frederick William, June 13, 1847.

by a petition from other men of the Mark, initiated by von Holtzendorff, a liberal of the Uckermark. It was rudely worded, and imperiously demanded the fulfilment of the late king's promises. Feeling in the west seemed especially dangerous. Stedmann, one of the Rhenish deputies, had printed for private circulation a booklet dealing with the constitutional law of the Rhenish duchies. It aimed at furnishing historical proof that never before had the Rhinelanders received "a lesser measure of personal liberty and civil rights" than they received under the Prussian regime. The ingratitude of these westlanders, from whose necks Frederick William III had lifted the iron yoke of Bonaparte, was positively shameless. In Mainz there came into existence a numerically powerful body called the Rhenish Union, which had branches all along the river from Crefeld to Carlsruhe, and whose aim it was to secure the unconditional maintenance of the *code Napoléon.* A "Rhenish Committee for the Establishment of the German Republic" spread broadcast an appeal "To Make Ready." This document was so packed with terms of abuse that it must almost certainly have been the work of Heinzen. It concluded with the following exhortation to the Rhinelanders: "Expel the Prussians! Down with Berlinism!"

Frederick William took little note of the oppressive atmosphere that prevailed throughout the country. At times, doubtless, he was disquieted by the reports coming to hand concerning demagogic intrigues, and at times, too, ridiculous trifles would disturb him profoundly. When Diepenbrock, the prince bishop, had informed him that there was a regicide club among the senior students of the Neisse gymnasium, he wrote in a contrite spirit: "I feel myself guilty, seeing that in the sight of God I am responsible for those to whom I delegate my authority. I confront Diepenbrock like a stupid young fellow who *does not know that which* he OUGHT TO KNOW were he a true king. May God better the matter!"[1] But such moods were of brief duration. He continued to feel perfectly confident of his own sovereignty. This was plainly manifest when General Boyen begged leave to resign shortly after the proroguing of the diet. The veteran was promoted to field marshal, made commander of the hospital for disabled soldiers, and died a few months later (February, 1848). A kindly fortune spared him the affliction of witnessing the Berlin

[1] King Frederick William to Thile and Bodelschwingh, January 24, 1848.

revolution. Bodelschwingh, in the opinion of friend and foe alike, was alone entitled to fill the vacant post of president of the ministry of state. As cabinet minister and minister for home affairs he already occupied the leading position in the ministerial council, and almost single-handed he had stoutly championed the king's interests in the diet. But under Frederick William IV there was no place for a real minister president, and Bodelschwingh would himself hardly have ventured to entertain the ambition of filling such a position. In order of seniority, Savigny was given the post, which in his hands could at best be but honorary.

Thus the king continued to rule as absolute monarch, and it was quite impossible for anyone to deflect him from the course which he had laid down for his parliamentary legislation. The members of his entourage now rarely ventured to contradict him. At most would General von Forstner, an outspoken man, go so far at times as to talk plainly to the beloved ruler concerning "his Poles," or similar fantasies.[1] Schönlein, physician in ordinary, a liberal and a great clinical teacher, whose Franconian bluntness had been accentuated by six years' sojourn in Switzerland, occasionally permitted himself some strong and homely expression; Frederick William would laugh indulgently, for he was acquainted with the South German proverb, "The Bambergers smoke coarse tobacco." Count Dohna-Lauck, an East Prussian but no liberal, entreated the king in November, 1847, to promise that the diet should be summoned at regular intervals, to do this before the various representative corporations should reassemble, and at the same time to introduce a simple bicameral system so that the curia of peers might be relieved from an intolerable position. Were this done, said the count, parliamentary legislation would receive its definitive form.[2] These were the same simple ideas which Count Arnim, when minister, had so frequently advocated. But the king's enigmatic designs remained unaffected. The estates were first of all to carry out to the letter everything which he had commanded. Not until then would he accord to his obedient children the last gift of his paternal favour, the periodic summoning of the diet.

[1] Forstner to Lieutenant Colonel von der Goltz, April 15, 1846.

[2] Count Dohna-Lauck to Bodelschwingh, July 28; Count Dohna-Lauck, Memorial, Concerning the Present Situation of Parliamentary Constitutional Relationships, November, 1847.

Thus did it happen. The national debt committee of the estates began its work in accordance with the king's instructions, and in January, 1848, the united committees assembled to discuss the criminal code. At the last moment, Beckerath declared that legalist scruples would compel him to absent himself. Ludolf Camphausen, more conciliatory than most of his fellow Rhinelanders, put in an appearance however. Profound was the impression when this man of patriotic sentiments, a loyal Prussian to the core, described in moving terms the course of the recent struggles. He was not entirely free from partisanship, but was by no means unjust, and spoke as follows: "When the estates came to the very frontier line, and when, leaning far out over the line as possible, they extended their hands in an offer of compromise, the offer was angrily repulsed. A single word would have sufficed to end once for all the constitutional dispute in Prussia. That word was not spoken. The consequences must be endured. But history will judge betwixt us and the government!" On the whole the united committee displayed great moderation, confining itself strictly to its immediate task. The draft of the criminal code was a serious document and carefully considered. A few only of its prescriptions seemed unduly harsh to the sentiments of the day, such as the article providing that in certain cases capital punishment was to be aggravated by the lopping off of the right hand and by the exposure of the head upon a spike. The Rhinelanders, however, clung obstinately to their *code Napoléon*, although in essentials its provisions were far stricter. Their Rhenish Union and their petty ultramontane journals were unanimous in warnings against "centralisation, the chimera of fraternisation." They would not see that it was a disgrace when, in the name of the same king of Prussia, an act should in one place be declared criminal and in another should be declared immune from punishment. To this crabbed provincial pride the moral value of a criminal code common to the whole country remained quite inconceivable. In the *Kölnische Zeitung*, Eduard Böcking, the able jurist of Bonn, published a trenchant criticism of the draft. His work was not deliberately designed to foster particularism, but it encouraged the Rhinelanders in their resistance. Suffice it to say, that the liberal press, which always reiterated parrot-wise whatever the Rhinelanders said, condemned the code in advance. In the diet, Savigny had said very little, but he now, almost

single-handed, took up the cause of the crown, and with superior calm defended the much-abused code point by point. He showed that nothing but a "mistaken humanitarianism" could object to capital punishment or flogging—for rascals. He showed that Prussia, as a member of the great Christian society of states, must regard it as a duty to punish those crimes also which had been committed abroad, though liberal sentimentality still contested this duty.

The discussions were nearing their close when tidings came to hand that the February revolution had broken out in Paris. In a moment the world was transformed. All the repressed wishes of recent years instantly found vent, and it was perfectly natural for the committee now to decide that the criminal code should not be promulgated until the united diet had likewise had an opportunity of discussing the proposed reform of criminal procedure. The last diet had with good reason demanded that the public and oral procedure introduced at the Berlin law courts should be extended throughout the country. This demand, too, seemed already to have been outstripped. Everyone was talking of trial by jury, which had so frequently been acclaimed as the bulwark of popular liberties, and it was felt that by juries alone could the just carrying out of the criminal law be assured. But Savigny, who failed to mark the approaching storm, could only issue a thoughtful warning, to the effect that opinions regarding the value of trial by jury were extremely conflicting.

Nor did the king yet realise that a new age had dawned. Pleased with the tranquil behaviour of his committees, he decided to address them personally, and in gracious terms, on March 6th. He was glad, he said, to be able to announce to them, seeing that all his commands had been adequately fulfilled, that in accordance with the wishes of his loyal estates he now decreed the periodic summoning of the united diet, and therewith, consequently, the limitation of the committees' sphere of activity. The word of deliverance had thus at length been spoken, but too late, and therefore fruitlessly. Had this royal resolve been made public a year earlier, the whole of the disastrous constitutionalist struggle would have been obviated, and Prussia, with a well-ordered and legally established parliamentary system, might have been able to bid defiance to anarchy. But the belated pledge, though it announced a decision made long before, now seemed to be nothing more

than an enforced concession. Within a few days the revolution marched over it, and the proud ruler, who had desired to point the way to his people step by step, had been humiliated and struck to the ground.

CHAPTER IX.

DECLINE OF THE GERMANIC FEDERATION.

§ 1. DECAY OF MONARCHICAL AUTHORITY IN THE MIDDLE-SIZED STATES.

It is doubtless possible for the thinker to conceive the great transformations of history as necessary, when he contemplates their causes and their effects. But he is never able to demonstrate why the change had to take place so and no otherwise, why at the decisive moment certain men and no others had to occupy the critical positions. The world of individual freedom, the coming and the going of historical personalities, are under the sway of laws whose divine rationality we can at times dimly realise, but can never fully understand. In Germany, the absolute power of the rulers, handed down from ancient days, had long been ripe for destruction, and the transition to the inevitable new order might still have been effected in a peaceful manner. But destiny decreed that the two most powerful and ablest representatives of monarchical absolutism, the two rulers who seemed as it were intoxicated with the exaltation of their royal egoism, should become estranged from their subjects at the very time when a friendly settlement seemed possible. Beyond question it was a terrible, an inevitable irony of fate that the two leading members of the German estate of princes were simultaneously to make personal experience of the impracticability of the old regime of personal government. Yet the isolated incidents in this tragedy of German absolutism are explicable solely as the outcome of individual experiences and sentiments.

With the summoning of the united diet, the king of Prussia had entered a path which seemed to lead almost indubitably to a well-ordered monarchy on a representative basis. But Frederick William's enigmatic obstinacy made it impossible for him to grant his magnanimous concessions

at the only time when these could have led to the creation of stable institutions. Not until too late did he promise to summon the diet at regular intervals. At the same epoch, the new year of 1847, conditions in Bavaria seemed equally promising. King Louis had awakened from his clericalist dreams. The demagogic ravings of the ultramontanes had convinced him during recent months that this party did not desire to support the crown, but to dominate the crown and to use it for ultramontane ends.[1] Two members of the detested Abel ministry had already been dismissed. Abel himself had had to surrender the administration of religious affairs, and dolorously exclaimed: "I no longer possess the king's confidence." Prince Leiningen, president of the assembly, had had good reason in the spring for warning the monarch that should the clericalist dominion continue, the revolution would find in Bavaria "a ploughed field ready for sowing."[2] Should events run a quiet course, it could confidently be anticipated that King Louis would ere long send Abel to join his dismissed colleagues, and would once more wield state authority in a parity spirit. Hatred for the rough partisan regime of the ultramontanes had flamed high. When a young student at the polytechnic school, who had been condemned to death on account of a duel, appealed against this judgment, the Munich court of appeal reduced the sentence to a brief term of imprisonment, adding that more severe measures would be inequitable, seeing that for like offences Wallerstein and Minister Abel had received no punishment.

Meanwhile, however, an incident had occurred which caused a sudden change in public feeling in Bavaria. In October, 1846, the dancer Lola Montez made her first appearance at the Munich theatre. A young woman of extremely dubious reputation, she had already had remarkable love adventures in the East Indies, England, Paris, Berlin, and Baden. Daughter of a Scotsman or Irishman and of a Creole mother, she combined the charms of northern and southern loveliness, and her looks doubtless merited her being painted by Stieler for the Wittelsbach ruler's gallery of beauties. She was no artist, but when in the passionate dance El Ole she displayed all the graces of her well-rounded and yet slender form, men found it hard to resist the ardent glances of her glorious eyes.

[1] Vide supra pp. 61 and 62.

[2] Prince Leiningen, two Memorials concerning the assembly, April, 1846.

Shameless and impudent, as insatiable in her voluptuous desires as Sempronia who took part in Catiline's conspiracy, among friends she could chatter agreeably and even with brilliancy. She could ride mettlesome horses, could sing thrillingly to the zither, could recite Spanish poems with vivacity and in a mellow voice. Those with whom she had a quarrel she would attack vigorously with a riding whip or even with boxes on the ear. The king, being a lover of beauty, was bewitched at the first sight of the dancer. As he himself subsequently admitted, it was as if she had given him a love philtre. For her he forgot the world, himself, and his royal dignity. Since the Wittelsbach muse could never keep silence, in the gossip-loving capital amazing poems were soon passing from hand to hand.

Strangely enough, whilst a crowd of youthful debauchees greedily surrounded the complaisant beauty, the king's passion was kept within certain bounds. Prince Bishop Diepenbrock of Breslau, his old admirer, had learned with profound sorrow of the great Munich scandal, and ventured to give the beloved monarch spiritual counsel. Among Catholic prelates, who look upon themselves as the chiefs in the greatest of all estates, a fine priestly candour towards the mighty ones of the earth is far commoner than it is among Protestant pastors. Louis, who knew the writer's noble disposition, accepted the words of warning quite simply, and pledged his honour that he had never demanded the last favours from Lola. By the king's instructions, a copy of this answer was actually sent to all the Bavarian bishops. But this could only make the little witch's power seem all the more enigmatic, and Canitz, when the Bavarian envoy assured him that the king's affection was purely platonic, responded with the calmness of the man of the world: "That makes his folly all the greater." At a very early date, indeed within a few days of Lola's arrival, the absurd rumour became current in Munich that the dancer had been sent by the English freemasons to carry on a campaign against the Jesuits. She had absolutely no principles, good or bad. She desired power, she wished to acquire political influence through the king's love. Since with feminine shrewdness she was quick to recognise that the Abel ministry was doomed, she had no inclination to run up her flag on a sinking ship. Moreover, in view of her mode of life, it would not have suited her to join hands with a priestly party which

must at least insist upon the preservation of a certain degree of decorum. We need not ascribe to the ultramontane ministers any serious moral scruples. They had cheerfully tolerated for a number of years the manifold gallant adventures of their amorous sovereign. In the camp of their enemies it was even maintained (though proof was lacking) that they had fruitlessly made secret endeavours to come to an understanding with the king's latest inamorata. However this may be, before long Lola proclaimed herself the open enemy of the clericalists; it was her ambition to be the modern Esther who would free the enslaved liberals of Bavaria; and she went so far as to favour the national aims of German liberalism. When, during these autumn days, Tiedemann and the other envoys from the Schleswig-Holstein patriots were received by King Louis, they could not fail to see Lola's dainty foot peeping out from behind the screen.[1]

The consequences were the worst that could have been feared. The king's resolve to break with the ultramontanes and to overthrow their partisan regime, a resolve which had been maturing for a considerable time and as the outcome of careful reflection, was strengthened by the activities of a notorious woman, with the result that, when it was at length carried into effect, it seemed to be the outcome of a sordid personal intrigue. As soon as Lola had taken a definite side, the entire clericalist press of Germany devoted itself day by day, in so far as the censorship would permit, to the publication of scandalous stories of happenings at the court of Munich. The radicals chimed in with malicious delight at the chance of discrediting monarchy. All the world was soon talking as if Bavaria were going to the dogs. The Bavarian press, of course, was compelled to maintain inviolable silence. In reality no political error was being committed. All that was at fault was a fanciful emotional aberration on the part of a sovereign who, having done so much for Germany's art, for the customs union, and for the land of Bavaria, might at least have expected to be judged with humane leniency, and who at this very moment had it in mind to free his subjects from a detestable partisan yoke. But the certainty of their impending overthrow embittered the ultramontanes to an extreme. Setting spies to work, they kept an accurate record of Lola's escapades, and attempted to send another warning to the king through

[1] Tiedemann's account of the matter.

the instrumentality of Count Seinsheim, one of the ministers, an old friend of Louis, and well acquainted with his earlier love affairs. Seinsheim however was sharply admonished to refrain from interfering in the private doings of the court, and thenceforward the language of the declining party became continually more outrageous.[1] In January, 1847, Count Reisach, Bishop of Eichstädt, was transferred to Munich as archbishop. His first pastoral letter was a masterpiece of priestly double-dealing and lust for power. He pointed out to the faithful that their touchstone in everything must be the opinion of the church; and speaking of the days of Max Joseph he referred to "the unhappy epoch when the Bavarian church was destroyed," writing with a calculated malice which wounded the king grievously.

Lola Montez, meanwhile, upon whom gifts were being showered, was unable to keep her ambition within bounds. She begged her exalted patron to bestow on her the rank of countess, and the king was infatuated enough to accede to her wishes. However foolish, his undertaking was not illegal. The conferring of distinctions of rank was one of the uncontested privileges of the crown, and in Bavaria the title in question had been of comparatively little importance since the days when Charles Theodore, as vice-regent of the empire, had conferred countships upon so many needy knights. But Lola, being a foreigner, had first to be naturalised, a pure matter of form in ordinary cases, though the law prescribed that the council of state must be consulted and that the naturalisation papers must be subscribed by one of the ministers. On this occasion the council of state advised against the step. But the advice was unauthoritative, and the king was not bound to follow it. Moreover, at this juncture, Count Bray, whose signature had been demanded, was away upon prolonged furlough. The four other ministers, Abel, Seinsheim, Gumppenberg, and Schrenck, who officially had nothing to do with the matter, now took counsel together, and with the shrewd insight of the experienced partisan Abel realised that the moment had at length arrived for effecting with formal unction and with all the grief of offended virtue a resignation that had long been imminent.

It would have been well with in the competence of the ministers to represent to the king that the proposed conferring

[1] Bernstorff's Reports, December 14, 1846; February 2, 1847.

upon Lola of the rank of countess would be a scandal, and that it could not fail to throw discredit even upon those high officers of state who had not directly participated in the affair. But instead of taking this course, the four malcontents submitted on February 11, 1847, a lengthy memorandum composed by Abel, one quite unprecedented in the annals of the German monarchies. Amid a flux of servile professions of devotion, they censured the king's relations with Lola in terms which no monarch of Louis' years—he was now over sixty—could possibly accept from his servants. "National sentiment," they wrote, "is profoundly affronted because Bavaria believes herself to be ruled by a foreigner of the worst possible reputation." Yet Lola had hitherto done nothing more than display her arrogance towards a few police officials, and had exerted no influence whatever upon affairs of state. With preposterous exaggeration the memorialists continued: "One and the same mood prevails in Berchtesgaden and Passau, in Aschaffenburg and Zweibrücken; it is diffused throughout Europe; it permeates the huts of the poor no less than the palaces of the rich. Not merely are the renown and the happiness of your majesty's government jeopardised, for monarchy itself is at hazard." They dared to tell the king a manifest untruth when they declared: "Ere long the armed forces of the crown will become a prey to the widespread disaffection, and whither could we look for aid were this terrible evil to ensue, were even this bulwark to totter?" It was true enough, thanks to the disgraceful maladministration of War Minister Gumppenberg, one of the signatories to the memorandum, that gross disorder was rife in the barracks of Munich. But who could believe that the merry and loyal Bavarian soldiers were likely to break their oath, merely on account of an unsavoury love episode, to break their oath to the "Ludwigel" for whom they still had much affection—unless their passions had been artificially inflamed by the priests? The ministers went on to warn the monarch of "the incalculable consequences" of the proceedings of the diet which was about to be summoned "under such conditions"—though in the event the parliamentary proceedings were to be comparatively tranquil. To conclude, they begged the king's leave to resign should he find it impossible "to accede to our urgent representations."

It is possible that some of the signatories had not fully

realised what the effect of their words would be. Abel, however, who knew his royal master intimately, could not fail to know that such disrespectful and almost threatening language would produce nothing but irritation in the autocrat's mind. The minister desired a breach with the king. His fall was inevitable and, as Canitz sarcastically phrased it, he hoped to retire with all the honours of war. The memorandum could not possibly be kept secret, any more than in Prussia it had been possible to keep secret Schön's booklet *Whence and Whither?* Within a few days the document was in everyone's hands, although all the four ministers solemnly protested innocence. Its effect was more disastrous than had ever been that of a demagogic lampoon. Many unprejudiced persons were influenced by the goody-goody tone of this emotional sermon in favour of virtue. The whole writing was obviously drafted with an eye to the great public. The court of Munich, however, has never forgotten the proof the clericalists gave on this occasion of the nature of their monarchical sentiments. The Wittelsbach rulers since then have been men of divergent views, but not one of them has again displayed full confidence in the ultramontane party. On February 16th all the ministers were dismissed. At the same time Hörmann, Lord Lieutenant of Upper Bavaria, an erstwhile member of the Black Committee in Mainz, and subsequently distinguished in Munich as a pitiless persecutor of the demagogues, was compelled to relinquish his post. Only after the issue of Abel's memorandum did Lola Montez acquire genuine political power, for to her illustrious lover the document seemed a confirmation of all that she had said concerning ultramontane ambitions. In her insane arrogance she actually wrote to *The Times* saying that although she had not personally brought about the ministerial changes, she believed that the king had had excellent reasons for what he had done! Louis savagely severed all connection with the party which had so long dominated him, and in a sonnet which was forthwith published he wrote:

> You who have desired to hold me in thrall, tremble!
> Greatly do I value the decisive event
> Which has overthrown your power for ever.

His wrath exceeded all bounds when the ultramontane professors now took the field against him. Lasaulx, one of

their hotspurs, a courageous, honest, and candid man, proposed in the senate that the university should express its grateful recognition to the ministers who had espoused the cause of good morals, for the university, he said, was "the leading moral corporation in the state"—a title of honour which, according to the Catholic view, should have been reserved for the church. The suggestion was obviously unbecoming, for the university had nothing to do with political disputes, and certainly owed no thanks to Abel, a rigid bureaucrat. Some of the professors voted in favour of it, whilst others attempted to pursue a middle course. The matter had not yet been finally decided when Rector Weissbrod, a man of servile disposition, communicated the results of the voting to the king, who could now not be withheld from immediate action even at Lola's request. On March 1st Lasaulx was dismissed his post. The students, who were fond of the fanciful philologian, and had found him a stimulating and eloquent lecturer, assembled in crowds to take farewell of him, and then thronged the street in front of Lola's house, whilst the dancer looked down contemptuously from the window. When the tumult was at its height, the king suddenly appeared upon the scene, and all made way for him respectfully. But when he left the house again, after paying Lola a prolonged visit, the temper of the mob broke loose, and in this town which owed him everything the creator of the new Munich was subjected to personal abuse. Coldly and calmly, with regal bearing, he strode through the howling mob. This incident was succeeded by blow after blow directed against the university, calling to mind the expulsion of the seven of Göttingen. Dismissals ensued in rapid succession, the first to go being the jurists Phillips and Moy, while the next victim was the historian Höfler, followed into retirement by Döllinger, Deutinger, and Sepp, all the clericalists whom Louis had appointed in earlier days when he had hoped to make his Munich a Catholic Berlin. Thus in blind rage did he destroy his own work. Two only were spared among the distinguished ultramontane professors, the veteran Görres, concerning whom Louis gave orders, "Leave the old man in peace"; and the faithful Nepomuk Ringseis. The last-named had definitely voted in favour of Lasaulx's proposal, but his old friend the king opined, "Nepomuk's a good fellow who has often told me home truths."

During the summer Louis paid a visit to his favourite

castle at Brückenau in the Fulda district. It was characteristic of his artistic taste that among the numerous beautiful regions in his country his preference was given, not to the transcendent splendours of those Alpine landscapes which are so apt to overburden the imagination, but to the gentle charm of this tranquil pasture-land surrounded by the forest-clad slopes of the Rhöngebirge. Here he was best able to dream and to poetise. His Lola soon followed him to his rural retreat, a squadron of cuirassiers accompanying her carriage to keep the Catholic mob at a distance. When Louis subsequently journeyed through the Palatinate, he was received everywhere with the old familiar loyalty. While he was en route he had a rencounter with Dönhoff, the federal envoy, and the Prussian was greatly astonished to note the complete change in the king's sentiments, so that Louis now spoke with the utmost asperity of the very men whom at Munich in earlier days he had been accustomed to defend against the count.[1] To Stahl, bishop of Würzburg, the king made an ungracious speech which was recorded by two of the royal aides-de-camp. It ran as follows: "The protector of the church—for such I have shown myself to be—its benefactor—not one of my predecessors ever made so many foundations at his private expense—is being so shamefully treated by the members of the ultra-clericalist party that these rival the doings of the jacobins. The party hostile to the pope is hostile to me also. For years past my eyes have been opened, continually wider, and should all clear-sighted persons close ranks round me, my eyes will remain open as long as I live. Should a hair be injured in the case of anyone dear to me, I shall show no mercy. I am well aware that intrigues are in progress in Würzburg. I do not say that you are a party to these intrigues, but I deem it expedient, before two witnesses, to acquaint you with my knowledge of the matter. Did I know you to be guilty, I should inform you of the fact. It is my way to speak frankly, and thus I hope to continue till my death. I say nothing of gratitude or of duties towards a sovereign lord, but such conduct is utterly stupid."[2]

Maurer, the Palatiner, was appointed leader of the new ministry. In the days of the Greek regency he had collaborated with Abel, but after their return to Bavaria, when Abel joined

[1] Dönhoff's Report, Aschaffenburg, August 20, 1847.

[2] King Louis, Address to the bishop of Würzburg, Aschaffenburg, August, 1847.

the ultramontanes, Maurer had completely broken with his old friend. To the horror of the clericalists, this Palatiner thus became the first Protestant minister Bavaria had known. In most of the German territories, despite the legally established parity of religions, the ancient memories of religious strife continued to exercise an influence, and in Prussia no Catholic minister was appointed until after the revolution. In the little Rohrbach palace near Heidelberg, Maurer had in childhood been a playmate to Louis. Man of learning rather than statesman, business-like, experienced, and industrious, he accepted his new and laborious office solely from a sense of duty, and in the honest hope that he would be able to heal the wounds inflicted on his country by the fierce rule of faction. He was compelled to sign the naturalisation papers of Countess Lola Landsfeld, although in the council of state he had recently declared that the proposed elevation in rank would be a positive "calamity." He was careful to avoid all personal relationships with the new countess. With fiery legislative zeal, such as in earlier years he had displayed in Greece, he now set to work upon the long-planned reform in the administration of justice, and he secured the king's assent to the introduction of public and oral procedure; but Louis would give no countenance to the idea of trial by jury. Behr and Eisenmann, the two liberals who had been so shamefully maltreated, were at length set at liberty. The universities received a new and somewhat more reasonable curriculum, and the students were granted more extensive rights of association. On the other hand, the missionary activities of the Redemptorists were restricted, and nuns were not allowed to take the vow until of full legal age. The new government was manifestly an honest one, and its devoted adherents were already referring to it as "the ministry of the dawn."

The court of Vienna was greatly distressed by the misfortunes of its Bavarian friends. Its envoy Count Senfft, who had for so long marched hand in hand with the Munich ultramontanes, gave banquets in honour of the fallen ministers. This led him to experience the full weight of King Louis' disfavour, and he was ultimately compelled to depart without a formal leave-taking. The Hofburg, being unable to master its ill-humour, was now represented for a time by chargés d'affaires only.[1] To the Protestant courts of Germany, Louis

[1] Arnim's Report, March 1; Bernstorff's Report, June 4, 1847.

sent confidential reports explaining the reasons for the change of ministry, and expressing the hope that relationships between the federated German territories would resume henceforward a friendlier complexion. It was time. For the moment the court of Munich was completely isolated. Bavaria had been universally shunned and suspected since Abel had positively dared to incite the bishops to a struggle against the ecclesiastical policy of the German governments.[1] The new ministers spoke of their predecessors with extreme acerbity. In an instruction to the envoy Lerchenfeld which was communicated to the Prussian foreign office, Maurer, after dilating upon Abel's policy, proceeded as follows: "This foolish and criminal conduct might seem utterly incredible did we not know that his majesty the king has long been contemplating a change in the system hitherto followed, a change likely to be advantageous, not merely to Bavarian interests, but to the interests of the entire German fatherland.[2] Most of the lesser courts responded with much gratification; the western powers, and the czar (ever hostile to the ultramontanes), manifested satisfaction; even the new pope expressed good wishes, for he desired religious peace. But Count Degenfeld, Würtemberg resident, wrote exultantly to Thile saying that Prussia could now acquire diplomatic hegemony in Munich, and he blamed Count Bernstorff for having failed to take advantage of the propitious hour.[3]

There were good reasons for Bernstorff's non-committal attitude, for it was never Frederick William's way to strike without thought for the consequences or to forget moral scruples in pursuit of political aims. Nowhere had the strange love-complications at Munich aroused so much distress as at the court of Prussia, for on moral questions the royal pair held views that were strict, nay, punctilious. Moreover, the king of Prussia was no less hostile to the newly dominant liberal tendency than he was to the defeated ultramontane party, and his consort felt profound compassion for her unhappy sister-in-law Queen Theresa, who endured a hard fate with almost superhuman patience. Canitz could not refrain from saying, with the pride of conscious virtue characteristic of the Prussian court of that day, that his own gracious sovereign,

[1] See above, p. 16.
[2] Maurer, Instruction to Count Lerchenfeld, March 1, 1847.
[3] Degenfeld to Thile, February 15, 1847.

by his demeanour towards the Roman church, illustrated the cogency of the old saying "sui victoria indicat regem." He expressed pleasure at the announced change of system and at "the strengthening of an old alliance"; but, he added cautiously "the circumstances which have led to the change scarcely seem to promise victory for the cause which we regard as our own." Yet more plainly did he speak in a covering letter to Bernstorff (March 9th): "We are offered an entente cordiale, and without conditions; we are assured that Bavarian policy is to be changed in a manner which we cannot fail to regard as desirable. . . . But do not the circumstances suggest those with which we are confronted when a friend who has fallen in the mire holds out a hand to us for help?" His advice was: "Let us turn the opportunity to account, but without allowing ourselves to be involved in the scandal, so that we may avoid giving any excuse for the belief that Lola Montez is our ally, or that we are closing our eyes to the facts in order to gain advantages at the expense of Herr von Abel & Co."[1] When the unhappy Wittelsbach ruler became more and more hopelessly entangled in the nets of his inamorata, and when her political power continued to increase, Canitz wrote (August 17th): "Kings ere now have lived with dancers. Such conduct is not praiseworthy, yet we can look on indulgently if a certain measure of decorum be observed. But this association of a system of government with being in love with a vagrant charmer is quite a new phenomenon, and seems as impossible to put up with as it is to govern in modern times by the writing of sonnets. To the dignity of monarchy infinitely more harm is done by such misconduct than by all the misdemeanours which the demagogues charge to its account."[2]

The judgment was harsh, but not unjust. The witch was gradually infecting the entire country as with the plague, and under such an ægis as hers even the well-meaning ministers Maurer, zu Rhein, and Zenetti appeared in a false light. The two parties of the ultramontanes and the "Lolamontanes" fought one another with degrading invectives. Lola took up her pen to write in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*: "Weary of being the target for so many malicious attacks, secret and open, oral, epistolary, and printed, I declare a base calumniator

[1] Canitz, Instruction to Bernstorff, with Covering Letter, March 9, 1847.
[2] Canitz to Bernstorff, August 17, 1847.

anyone who, in whatever manner, disseminates an evil report against me without being able to prove it." Hoffmann and Campe of Hamburg, who published for the Young German radicals, issued a writing by P. Erdmann glorifying free love and entitled *Lola Montez and the Jesuits.* The book opened with the words: "The world is far, as yet, from having attained to clear views as to what morality really is." It closed with a comment upon a saying from Heinse's *Ardinghello:* "We are still unable to free ourselves from the cancer of prejudices hoary with antiquity." From the other side came such lampoons as *Lola Montez, or the Wench belongs to the King.*[1] Louis' sonnet *The Decisive Event* was ridiculed in countless parodies. The whole thing was positively nauseating. In Paris, Jacob Venedey, simple-minded and honest blusterer, had to learn how universally people's minds had been confused by these mad doings in Bavaria. As a Teutonist champion of morals and vigilant guardian of chastity, he penned an impudent essay entitled *The Spanish Dancer and German Liberty.* Since, owing to the censorship, the German newspapers could not publish his effusion, he offered it to Marrast, editor of *Le National.* Marrast's curt answer was: "We cannot attack a friend to the liberals." Venedey next turned to the Fourierists, Considérant and Cantagrel. They laughed him to scorn, saying that the German liberals were "absurd" to cling "to the old morality," and to enquire as to the mode of life of their protectress! The German demagogue thereupon exclaimed with all the pathos of the sometime Burschenchafter: "I cannot accept liberty from unclean hands." But Cantagrel, who had been intimately acquainted with the lady during her sojourn in Paris, answered with the mien of a conqueror: "You mistake, Lola's hands are clean and beautiful!" Venedey had all this printed, not realising how foolish he made himself look. But assuredly it was a disastrous sign of the times that a German king, the protector of the church, should thus be defended by the preachers of the "new morality" of communism.

In October, 1847, the diet met for a brief session, in order to discuss a new railway loan. The proceedings were tranquil on the whole, for no one could say anything from the tribune

[1] The German title is, Lola Montez, oder Das Mensch gehört dem Könige. There is a play upon the word "Mensch," which means both "human being" and "wench" or "hussy."

anent the scandal about which all the world was talking. The provincial liberals, moreover, and especially the Palatiners, were delighted that the hated clericalist regime had at length been overthrown. They rejoiced to hear a royal utterance that was being busily disseminated: "The rule of the Jesuits has come to an end in Bavaria." Detestation for the vanquished party was manifested only in a few stormy scenes. Prince Wrede asked the upper house to expel the new archbishop of Munich, who in the Germanicum had taken the vow of the Jesuit order. Count Reisach thereupon, with an assumption of innocence stupefying to all who really knew the facts, declared that he did not belong to the Society of Jesus. In the address, the members of the lower house proclaimed their confidence in the new advisers of the crown, at the same time expressing the hope that "the splendid structure of the customs union" would lead "to a yet completer unification of all the peoples of Germany." The liberal tone thus sounded was given yet louder vent when a motion for freedom of the press was discussed, and was ultimately adopted almost unanimously even by the upper house. The king approved the motion, seeing that the much-discussed revision of the federal press law was still in the distant future. On December 17th, in violation of the federal law, he decreed that henceforward none but articles concerning foreign policy should be subject to the censorship.

Before the country was able to enjoy this gift, the Maurer ministry had collapsed. It was the tragic destiny of Louis that his insane love passion was now to spoil the working even of his well-conceived reforms. Since her return from Brückenau, Lola had boldly assumed the airs of a queen. She dispensed lavish hospitality in the charming villa the king had built for her in the Barerstrasse. She drove through the town with a splendid team of horses, and wherever she appeared there were disturbances, which had to be quelled by the laborious efforts of the gendarmes and plain-clothes policemen devoted to her service. She now wished to secure admittance to high society, but all doors were closed to her. Even one of the king's aides-de-camp, a son of Louis' old friend von der Tann, refused to visit the countess. Louis invoked maledictions upon the priests and the old wives who were embittering the life of his beloved, and since Maurer likewise steadfastly refused social relationships with Lola, the minister had to give way

before the dancer. On December 1st, immediately after the close of the session, a new government was appointed, and it promptly received the appropriate nickname of "the Lola ministry." Prince Oettingen-Wallerstein, the incalculable, who of late years, heavily burdened with debt, had tended more and more to become a mere adventurer, accepted without demur the leadership in this cabinet, lightheartedly believing himself capable of avoiding close association with the dancer. Universal loathing was felt for one of his new colleagues, Berks by name, a common fellow and boastful talker, who had hitherto done service only as Lola's travelling companion. Henceforward the popular movement in Munich, fostered mainly by the ultramontanes, assumed a new aspect. It was true that the wrath of the clericalists continued to increase, above all now that two of their fiercest opponents, Hormayr and Fallmerayer had been summoned to the archives and to the university respectively. But the spirit of faction was from this time less powerful than was the natural sentiment of loathing. The crazy foreign woman had pushed things too far. In the end her monstrous Spanish arrogance enraged everyone without distinction of party, excepting always the rabble of her hangers-on and the infatuated king. "The woman must go!" This cry was universal, and there now began a typically Bavarian manifestation of lynch law, in which the angry vigilantes completely forgot that their indignation was being wreaked upon the king also, although the king ought to have been exempt.

The leadership in this opposition, which had become quite unpolitical, was once more taken by the university. Delighted with their newly accorded freedom of association, the students had already forgotten the expulsion of so many of their beloved teachers. But one day some young fellows belonging to the Palatia corps, who were passing through the Barerstrasse, observed two of their fellow members sitting at ease in the notorious villa, and perceived that one of the student's Palatine caps was jauntily crowning Lola's beautiful black hair. This touched the honour of the Palatia, for the German students' associations have invariably cherished a chivalrous sentiment for the immaculate reputation of their colours. The two offenders were expelled from the corps and hastened to join with others of their own kidney in founding a new corps, the Alemannia, whose headquarters were established in the back

premises of the countess' villa. They were all handsome lads, elegantly clad at the expense of their lady friend, a ne'er-do-weel and loose-living crowd. This scum of the university now constituted Lola's bodyguard whenever she passed through the streets or visited the coffee houses. The Alemannias assumed a swashbuckling demeanour in the lecture theatres, which they began to attend for the first time. But whenever a red Alemannia cap appeared on the scene, the other students began to hoot, to hiss, to whistle, and would then leave the hall in a body. Determination was fixed throughout the university that such a rout as that of the Alemannias was no longer to be tolerated, and at this juncture Minister Berks actually ventured at a students' drinking party to extol the Alemannias as cultivators of study, humanity, and morality, and to hold up Lola's train of followers as an example to corrupt youth. This was more than the German Bursch could stand. Even Thiersch, the new rector, though universally beloved, was no longer able by his paternal admonitions to restrain the young men's fury.

Whilst these academic bickerings were in progress, the death of Görres took place on January 29, 1848. He could not have had a happier end, for he was now universally acclaimed as the unyielding and candid foe of a despised government. On his deathbed he said: "The state rules, the church protects." His declared opponents could not but feel that throughout his extensive divagations from jacobinism to the clericalist party, this man of highly imaginative temperament had never been untrue to himself. In the eyes of the nation he remained the vigorous mouthpiece of the *Rheinische Merkur*. His funeral took the form of a threatening demonstration against the new government, and the police, utterly subservient to Lola, caused yet further irritation among the students and the townsfolk by rough interference. On February 7, 1848, when a noisy crowd filled the square in front of the new university buildings at the Victory Gate, the Alemannias encountered their enemies with astonishing brazenness. On the 9th the disturbances were renewed and were more violent on this occasion. Fierce mobs surged up and down the long Ludwigstrasse from the Victory Gate to the Hofgarten; one of the Alemannias drew a dagger upon a fellow student, and then took to his heels with his comrades. Lola now suddenly appeared in the arcades of the Hofgarten. She was

received with a yell of execration, pelted with stones and filth, and forced to take refuge in the adjoining Theatine church.

The king's anger knew no bounds. That very day he issued orders that the university was to be closed until the following winter. Seventeen years earlier, when the students had been unruly, he had threatened them with the same punishment.[1] On that occasion the hasty measure had been quietly rescinded, but now the news ran through the excited city like wildfire. The burghers were loud in their complaints, for many of them made their livelihood out of the professors and the students. At their urgent request the king yielded a step, and promised that the university should be reopened for the summer term. The concession was inadequate. On February 11th a great town-meeting was held in the town hall, while the Schrannenplatz outside was densely thronged. After indignant speeches it was agreed that a fresh request should immediately be made of the monarch; delegates were at once despatched to the palace and were accompanied by the crowd. The worst was feared, for the recent beer riots had accustomed the mob to disorderly conduct, and bitterness was widespread owing to the overbearing of the conduct of the gendarmes. At length Prince Wallerstein appeared at the palace gate to announce that the request was granted and that the university would be reopened forthwith. At the same time he told the bystanders that Countess Landsfeld would leave Munich that evening. With shouts of exultation the mob flocked to the Barerstrasse to await Lola's departure. The gate was suddenly opened, and the countess drove away at top speed. The crowd now stormed into the house and began to destroy the contents. Then the king appeared upon the scene, saying curtly and loudly: "Spare my property!" Suddenly the tumult was stilled, heads were bared, some one began to sing: "Hail to our king, hail!" and all joined in, whilst Louis strode silently away.

Thus the spectre seemed to have been laid, the mad gypsy dance to have been brought to a close. Pious interpreters could discern the writing of God's finger, for the mischievous woman had been compelled to evacuate the field on the very anniversary of Abel's memorandum. Perspicacious persons were confident that peace would now prevail. They felt sure that the easy-going Munichers would not be censorious towards

[1] See vol. V, p. 292.

Louis on account of his aberrations in the pleasure garden of love; it had ever been the Bavarian way to forgive readily, and to eschew petty rancour. Louis held other views. At heart he was still enthralled by Lola, and continued to hope for her return; he was extremely bitter on account of the detestable ingratitude of the people of Munich; and he felt so profoundly humiliated because of the concessions that had been wrung from him that he seriously pondered the question of abdicating, of handing over the crown to a successor who was in every respect a lesser man than himself. While he was still in two minds concerning this point, tidings came that the revolution had broken out in Paris. Fresh disturbances occurred in Munich; the prestige of the crown, already shaken, was yet further endangered; and in blind rage Louis decided upon a needless abdication, which was destined to prove unfortunate alike for Germany and for Bavaria.

The Wittelsbachers, who were greatly loved by their subjects, were in a position to outlive speedily the effects of these aberrations and party struggles, which were, after all, little more than casual incidents. The prestige of the German estate of princes was far more profoundly injured by the progressive degeneration of the electoral house of Hesse. Utterly diverse in type and temperament had been the numerous diplomats successively representing the Prussian court in Cassel. First of all there had been Hänlein, the ponderous imperial jurist of Ratisbon; next came Hänlein, junior, a man fond of good living; next, the sharp-tongued Canitz, whose inclination in this post was to speak as gently as possible concerning his beloved Hessian home; Canitz was succeeded by Stach von Goltzheim, by no means overburdened with brains; at the date we have now reached, Prussia was represented by Count Galen from Westphalia, a strict clericalist who had resigned from the diplomatic service in the days of the Cologne episcopal dispute, but had reentered it after the late king's death. In one respect, however, all the Prussian ambassadorial reports were unanimous; they all breathed indignation with this unconscientious princely family, although at Berlin its scions were still regarded as loyal federal allies. The electoral prince and coregent seemed to foresee the judgment that would be passed upon him by posterity, and by his orders all important documents relating to his reign were so carefully put out of the way that in the Marburg

archives to-day absolutely nothing can be discovered relating to this epoch. The Hessian populace maintained its dynastic fidelity by the exercise of extreme self-constraint. On the elector's birthday a patriotic poet sang: "Let cheers resound in joyous tone to the dear sire and the dear son!" Yet hatred for the dear son was so widespread that Stach von Goltzheim, in great distress, was forced to admit that he was not acquainted with "a single honest supporter and admirer of the electoral prince." [1] The Hessian people began to look longingly towards the father, who still lived abroad in dudgeon.

When the unhappy electress Augusta died and the old gentleman promptly married the countess Reichenbach (1841), the Cassel town council, in an address which was kept strictly private begged that he and his spouse would return to the capital.[2] Shortly afterwards Countess Reichenbach also died, and the elector now married for the third time, espousing a Hessian woman, Baroness von Berlepsch, who was raised to the rank of Countess Bergen. With his estimable and amiable wife the elector henceforward lived a perfectly respectable life at Frankfort, only leaving his pretty villa on the shores of the Main for an occasional visit to the gaming tables at Homburg, and the Electoral Hessians were perfectly ready to welcome their reformed sovereign with open arms. But his son trembled at the thought of the old man's return. He urgently begged the protection of the two great powers, and on one occasion travelled as far as Silesia to see King Frederick William and make sure that he could count upon the help of Prussia. All this anxiety was needless. The elector had no inclination to relinquish his tranquil home existence. He was much gratified by the various proofs of affection which came to him from Hesse, and during the closing years of his life he became tolerably well reconciled with the estates and with his mutinous capital. The son, meanwhile, did all that was humanly possible to keep alive the popular longing for his father. He retained his grip upon the Rotenburg Quart which he had filched from the country; [3] and after the Bundestag had declared this question to be outside its jurisdiction, the complaints of the estates were of no further avail.

Though the diet renewed on several occasions its hopeless

[1] Stach's Report, November 4, 1841.
[2] Stach's Report, August 21, 1841.
[3] See vol. VI, p. 159.

attempts to impeach ministers, Scheffer treated it with the utmost contempt, more scornfully even than Hassenpflug. He demanded the keys of the diet house. When these were refused, he had the doors broken open and new locks fitted. He dismissed the newly appointed stenographers, although the constitution specified that the debates should be public. On one occasion he dissolved the diet whilst a sitting was actually in progress, saying gruffly: "Gentlemen, you are dismissed!" It seemed as if he were spoiling for a fight, and were ever on the search for new causes of quarrel. Quite unexpectedly he put forward the demand that every deputy of the three estates united in a single chamber should actually belong to the estate he represented. This was not prescribed by the constitution, and no such rule had hitherto been followed. But the new doctrine of representation by estates, hailing from Berlin, had found disciples in Cassel. The government obstinately maintained that a deputy could only represent the rights of his own estate, and after a prolonged and unseemly dispute was able to secure the removal of two personæ ingratæ from the diet.

The coregent had no liking for the clericalists. Believing in only one god, Mammon, he was anything but partial to the reactionary pietists who thronged his court, and had even less leaning towards the Roman church which could so readily build a state within the state. The bishop of Fulda was continually complaining, and had usually good reason to complain, of petty bureaucratic vexations. Least of all, however, would Frederick William show any favour towards the new free-thinking churches. Metternich, whose favour he busily wooed in the hope of securing an Austrian princely coronet for his wife, had at Johannisberg, where the electoral prince was on a visit, thoroughly indoctrinated Frederick William anent the dangerous designs of the German Catholics. By a ridiculous chance, at this very juncture, Sybel and Gildemeister, the Bonn professors who had so efficiently exposed the fable of the Holy Coat, were summoned to Marburg university. The literary crimes of the pair were sedulously concealed from the electoral prince by his advisers.[1] Frederick William persecuted the German Catholic sect, disregarding the representations of the diet; although this body had barely one hundred adherents in Hesse, he forbade it to establish congregations; he actually

[1] From a private communication sent me by H. von Sybel.

had the corpse of a blameless German Catholic burgher exhumed from the Hanau churchyard. During these gentler days, the follies of the Hessian censorship could be rivalled only in Austria. The newspapers, now well broken in, were not permitted to say a word in reference to the gifts which the electoral prince's mother had made to the town of Cassel. A liberal bookseller of Marburg, who had planned the issue of a statistical journal could not induce the government to provide a censor for this publication, and was at length compelled, to the general amusement, to lodge a "plaint demanding the appointment of a censor"—for the journal could not be issued unless it had passed the censor. The foolish caricature of the German Michael, one greatly beloved by the Young German radicals, was regarded by the police as peculiarly inflammatory. Wherever this picture was seen, whether in newspapers or in pamphlets, it was unhesitatingly confiscated, and on one occasion Friedrich Oetker, a witty liberal lawyer, was commissioned by a number of newspapers to elaborate a statement "concerning seven German Michaels."

Small, however, was the importance of such ridiculous incidents when compared with the terrible fate of Sylvester Jordan, which aroused excitement throughout Germany. For many years the police authorities had been secretly collecting material in order to prove that the father of the Hessian constitution had been privy to the storming of the Frankfort guard-house and to the other conspiracies of those long-forgotten days. At length, when they considered that the proof was complete, Jordan was arrested in August, 1839, upon a charge of high treason, and was confined in the Bergschloss at Marburg. Here he was detained for a lengthy period under rigorous imprisonment, looking down upon the city which had once welcomed him with princely honours. Once again he fell into a pit which had been digged by his own hands. In earlier days, for the more efficient muzzling of hostile ministers, he had introduced into the constitution article 126, whereby, in accusations of infringement of the constitution, both quashing of the proceedings and the granting of a pardon were prohibited. The result was that this charge against Jordan, once initiated, had to be carried to a conclusion. Since his health was seriously affected by his imprisonment, he was at length allowed to live in the town under strict supervision. But the decision of the court was not given till 1843, when he was condemned

for "failure to prevent treasonable undertakings." He appealed, and the supreme court of appeal, fearless as always towards those in high position as towards those in low, acquitted him unreservedly in October, 1845.

Most of the witnesses for the prosecution were persons of dubious character, and it was perfectly obvious that the blustering German and Polish demagogues with whom in those days he had associated had misused Jordan's name, as they had misused the names of many other persons of position, in order to win new recruits. It is quite possible that he had heard something of various foolish proposals, but who could blame him if he had paid no serious heed to all this hare-brained oratory? In any case what a monstrous affair! He was arrested seven years after the alleged offence, spent six years under rigorous arrest, to be completely acquitted in the end. The impracticability of the old secret procedure was plainly demonstrated by this trial, just because no act of violence, no infringement of the formal law was in question. For these reasons the demonstration was plainer than had been that furnished by Weidig's unhappy fate. A crowd of liberal writers, led by the irrepressible Welcker, promptly seized upon the affair as a means for arraigning secret judicial procedure. Jordan's *Wanderings from my Prison*, which he wrote in the Bergschloss, were voiced in the rough tones of the earlier liberalism, being directed against standing armies, against the barbarism of capital punishment, and against all compromisers and Laodiceans. But when the unfortunate man was at length acquitted, he was broken in mind and body. His constitution was not sufficiently tough to endure so much suffering. Henceforward he showed himself inclined above all towards peace, almost too much so in fact.

The old elector died in November, 1847, and under normal conditions the electoral hat would have passed unnoticed to his son, just as in Saxony the royal crown had passed unnoticed to the good coregent, Prince Frederick Augustus. It was sixteen years since the electoral prince had taken over the affairs of government, and he had then sworn "to maintain the constitution of the electoral state." But in accordance with the new court doctrine, the doctrine which had secured so signal a victory in the Guelph realm, it was every ruler's privilege, as soon as he began to reign in his own right, to decide whether he would or would not recognise the territorial

constitution. No one was more heartily inclined to acclaim this new doctrine than the electoral prince. He no longer felt bound by the oath to the constitution which he had taken as regent, for to him conscience was as unmeaning as honour to Falstaff. For years it had been his design to make an end of the detested state fundamental law as soon as he should ascend the throne. The only difficulty was his lack of nerve! The father had doubtless been well acquainted with the son's inclinations. In the year 1841, when the old elector was beginning to become reconciled with his country, he had deposited with a Frankfort lawyer a testamentary letter to the diet. Herein he granted pardon to "unworthy persons" for "outbreaks of rude passion," and at the same time he exhorted the diet "to banish the spirit of contradiction, euphemistically termed opposition . . . and thus to ensure the maintenance of the constitution we have granted."

This was a definite hint, and the diet, directly the testamentary letter was communicated to it, hastened to send it to the new elector, with an epistle of condolence. But the estates were not given audience. The new ruler was still hesitating. His first step was to demand from the troops a new oath of fealty, tendered on behalf of his person alone, and it was then made plain how burdensome to the consciences of honourable soldiers had been the foolish liberal invention of the twofold oath. Years before, many of the officers had taken the oath to the constitution with extreme reluctance; but now, long after it had been sworn, they were threatened with trouble from the other side. Some of them asked counsel of Colonel Urff, commander of the body-guard, and Colonel Gerland, commander of the artillery. These two excellent officers explained their comrades' difficulties to the elector, and were thereupon ungraciously informed that the old oath to the constitution naturally remained in force. "All that the new pledge implies," said the elector, "is that there has been a change in the person of the ruler." [1] The troops thereupon took the oath, but the elector showed himself on this occasion to be even more rancorous than usual, and some of the officers who had given utterance to their scruples were as a punishment transferred to other posts. Meanwhile there had been a recurrence of the domestic quarrels which inevitably accompanied any notable change in Hessian territorial history. The old elector

[1] Galen's Reports, December 8 and 11, 1847.

had invested his extensive possessions abroad, to some extent in Austria, to some extent with Amschel Rothschild or elsewhere in Frankfort. The son was not slow to harbour suspicion that some of the property might be withheld from him, and he sent his gendarmes to make enquiries in Frankfort, whereupon the senate of the free city entered an indignant protest against the violation of its sovereignty. Next Frederick William endeavoured to institute legal proceedings against Deines, his father's confidential agent, but Deines had long since become an Austrian subject. The late elector had been careful to burn the accounts relating to the property of the Reichenbach children, and since the entailed fund was intact, the affectionate son could do nothing. His next step was to send commissaries to the villa on the Main, in order to expel Countess Bergen from the house, and the elector commanded the Hessian federal envoy to take up his residence there as soon as possible, for the envoy would be hard to expel from the villa owing to the right of exterritoriality. But the valiant countess chased the intruders away, having first shown them a document to prove that she was the rightful heiress. And so on, and so on, all in the traditional Electoral Hessian family style.[1] Emperor Ferdinand whom the old elector had nominated executor of his will, refused to act, for Metternich considered it undesirable that the ruling house of Austria should risk being besmirched with this Electoral Hessian filth.[2] The new elector was in evil odour at the Bundestag, for he had just begun an unsavoury quarrel with Waldeck concerning alleged feudal rights. The general opinion among the federal envoys was that the elector aimed solely at securing a handsome payment upon the relinquishment of his claims.[3]

The fate of the Hessian constitution rested with Vienna and Berlin, for without the definite aid of the two great powers the elector would hazard nothing, and he had quite recently, as so often before, requested written advice from Metternich. King Frederick William did not hesitate for a moment. He bluntly called the Hessian an ill-conditioned fellow, and would do nothing to countenance the elector's plans for a coup d'état. In truth, this time of excitement was ill-suited to a repetition of the Guelph coup. On November 30th, therefore,

[1] Dönhoff's Reports, Frankfort, November 20, 1847, et seq.
[2] Dönhoff's Report, December 31; Galen's Report, December 22, 1847.
[3] Dönhoff's Report, April 22, 1847.

Canitz sent to Galen an instruction which was communicated to the Hessian court. Urgent warnings were given against illegal steps. If the new ruler found that certain articles in the radical constitution were absolutely unendurable, he should request the Bundestag to guarantee the fundamental law; an opportunity would then spontaneously arise for peaceful negotiations with the estates concerning a few alterations. Canitz' advice was no less well-meant than were the exhortations he simultaneously despatched to the Danish court. This advice, if followed in good time, might well have saved Hesse from tragical struggles. But in Cassel as in Copenhagen men were stronger than rational grounds. The elector would doubtless have ventured upon a forcible coup d'état with the assistance of the two great powers, but he lacked courage, understanding, and will, for difficult negotiations simultaneously conducted with the Bundestag and with the estates. General Gerlach, who brought the king's letter of condolence, gave advice similar to that of Canitz. The general's impression of the court of Cassel was most gloomy. He expressed the fear that this prince had "an evil heart and an absolutist disposition, and that he suffered from avarice and from a lack of affection for his country." While Gerlach was still in Cassel, Councillor Philippsberg arrived from Vienna on December 11th, bearing Metternich's answer and an accompanying opinion. This Austrian memorial was identical almost word for word with Canitz' despatch, and had therefore presumably been drafted in collaboration with the court of Berlin.[1] Greatly had the times changed! In the year 1831 Metternich had definitely rejected the idea of a federal guarantee for this radical constitution,[2] and a rumour was current and was widely believed by the courts that the Austrian chancellor had subsequently conducted negotiations with the prince regent, with a view to a coup d'état. Yet now Metternich himself advised the new elector to request the guarantee of the Federation on behalf of the fundamental law, though of course under conditions which could not yet be foreseen. Metternich would hear nothing more of a forcible overthrow of the existing order. These declarations from the two German great powers sufficed for the time being to avert the Hessian coup d'état. On December 12th, Albert the prince consort sent a warning letter to the king of Prussia,

[1] Galen's Reports, December 4, 8, 11, and 12, 1847.
[2] See vol. V, pp. 163-4.

but the letter did not come to hand until long after the issue had been settled.

In manifest disappointment the elector, within a few hours of receiving the Austrian reply, summoned the representatives of the diet to an audience in order, at length, to accept their epistle of condolence. Their reception was friendly, and the estates tacitly assumed that their ruler still regarded as binding the oath he had taken upon assuming the regency. The new ruler said nothing openly about this matter, but he gave the diet to understand that the constitution required to be safeguarded, on the one hand, and to be modified in certain respects, on the other.[1] His intention therefore, was to accept the advice of the great powers, and to ask the Bundestag to guarantee the constitution. He promptly appointed a committee of three officials to draft the necessary modifications in the constitution. But the work made little progress, for perspicacity and straightforwardness were alike lacking. In these remarkable conditions, and under the rule of a detested sovereign who had been held back from being forsworn solely by the advice of the great powers, the unhappy country was assailed by the storms of the revolution.

The old Guelph sovereign could not regard the results of his coup d'état with unalloyed satisfaction. The new fundamental law had in the end been secured by lying and trickery. Stüve, the most dangerous member of the opposition, was unable to attend the diet, for in a political trial instituted against him, though not condemned, he had not been formally acquitted. In the government's view, therefore, Stüve's character was no longer immaculate. Danton's principle that every suspect is to be treated as guilty, found more faithful adherents at this reactionary court than anywhere else, and after his victory Ernest Augustus scorned to conciliate the vanquished by an amnesty. The king's relationship to the new diet remained unfriendly, were it only because the coup d'état soon proved to have been a folly from the economic point of view. The crown treasury, after its forcible reestablishment, was unable to balance its income to its expenditure. Again and again it was compelled to appeal for help to the diet, and each time

[1] Galen's Report, December 16, 1847.

bitter complaints were uttered. In the mutilated assembly, the liberal ideas of the day made unceasing headway. Incredible as it would have seemed a few years earlier, some of the members of the Lüneburg Ritterschaft were now demanding representation for the estate of peasants. Among the common people a mutinous silence prevailed, for one only of the king's activities, his struggle with the customs union, gave general and complete satisfaction. Guelph obstinacy and Hanoverian stubbornness found common standing ground in particularism. "No one wants to budge," said Stüve in simple explanation of the mood prevailing throughout the country. "Hanover, Hildesheim, and Celle are afraid of Brunswick; the cloth weavers of Osterode are afraid of Quedlinburg; the peasants of rural Bremen and of Lüneburg dread detachment from Hamburg and Bremen."[1] Moreover, the Guelph was most unmannerly towards his Prussian neighbours. "I receive no Catholic diplomats from Prussia," he said defiantly when he was informed that Count Westphalen had been appointed Prussian envoy. The ingrained no-popery sentiments of the old Orangeman were doubtless contributory, but the chief trouble was that Westphalen was son-in-law of the detested Canitz. Prussian traditions made it impossible for King Frederick William to ignore this deliberate spurning of a Catholic, and the consequence was that the Hanoverian embassy had to remain untenanted for a considerable period.[2] Yet more arrogant was the demeanour of Ernest Augustus towards the lesser neighbouring princes. He was in a positive fury when Starklof, cabinet councillor to the grand duke of Oldenburg, had in a novel suggested that since a blind peasant lad should never inherit his father's farm, still less should a blind prince inherit the crown. The king would not let the matter drop until Starklof had been dismissed.

This novel wounded him in his tenderest feelings, for it remained his peculiar pride that in defiance of the laws of nature, in defiance of the imperial law, and in defiance even of Guelph family custom, he had insured his son's succession to the crown. Whenever he left the kingdom, he entrusted the affairs of government to George. The world was to learn that in the Guelph realm the impossible was

[1] Stüve's Biography.

[2] Knyphausen's Report, October 7, 1847.

possible. The crown prince was already showing himself to be a worthy descendant of the Stuarts, for he spoke with sinister presumption of God's fief which would eventually pass into his charge, and of the eternal duration of the Guelph realm. The father spoke with the same preposterous confidence, but the unction was lacking. In April, 1847, his loyal estates ventured to petition for publicity of the proceedings of the diet. So markedly had the wind changed that even the upper house voted almost unanimously in favour of this proposal. On April 21st was issued the royal answer, countersigned by Falcke. Scheele was dead, but there had been no change in the tenour of Guelph official documents, which still preserved their familiar brutality. With a flux of ungracious words the king informed the estates that publicity would serve merely to arouse wishes that could never be satisfied, to foster an artificial public opinion, to excite the masses and lead them astray. He concluded by saying: "We have therefore inalterably determined that we shall *never* concede publicity of the sittings of the chambers." Thus did the Guelph utter his "never," a few days after King Frederick William had thundered "no and never" to the united diet. Within a year both uncle and nephew were to learn that even kings cannot prescribe a path for the living God.

The tranquil land of Mecklenburg was no longer exempt from the influence of the liberal current. With excellent reason, but still in vain, the bourgeois landlords were demanding full participation in representative rights, this participation being contested by the nobility. Grand Duke George of Strelitz, now an old man, was deeply concerned, and complained to his nephew of Prussia: "You are aware that our bourgeois landowners, the great majority at any rate, unfortunately belong to the liberal party. It is a distressing fact that this party makes continual progress, and that the progress we effect in desirable matters by no means keeps pace with the aforesaid so-called progress."[1] The Rostock Teutonist, Georg Beseler, brother to Wilhelm Beseler of Schleswig-Holstein fame, worthily championed the cause of the middle class. Kamptz, the ex-minister, who could never forget the Mecklenburg nobleman, wrote with customary

[1] Grand Duke George of Strelitz to King Frederick William, September 23, 1844.

roughness on behalf of the aristocracy. What these nobles understood by "desirable progress" was shown by a resolution of the diet begging the two serene highnesses for freedom of the press, on the ground that the impudence of the liberal papers could not be restrained by a lax censorship, but that heavy penalties must be imposed.

Very different, but none the less menacing, was the aspect of affairs in Saxony. Good King Frederick Augustus was doing his honest best to restore domestic peace, and apart from a few suppressions of newspapers there was no trace of rule with the heavy hand. But the unlucky street fighting in Leipzig had left a sense of extreme bitterness in its train. The opposition in the diet, which had little tincture of the national sentiments characteristic of South German liberalism, endeavoured to make up for lack of talent by uncurbed rudeness. Organisation of the army reserve was urgently requisite, and was prescribed by the federal law, but the opposition resisted the measure; it repeatedly demanded that the troops should be compelled to swear fealty to the constitution; and by the ventilation of petty and often ridiculous grievances it tried to incite the soldiers against their superior officers. Peculiar favour was accorded to the gymnastic clubs, which in Saxony speedily passed under radical influence, and became nurseries of barricade fighting. The proposal to replace military drill by gymnastic training, an idea which the prince of Prussia had found it necessary to resist in the Prussian ministry of state, was widely supported in Saxony. On one occasion Nostitz-Wallwitz, minister for war, a blunt soldier, had a loaf of army bread brought direct from the barrack to the diet, and insisted that the liberals must taste it to convince themselves by personal experience how little justification there was for the abuse immoderately showered upon this delicacy.

The incident was a pleasant relief to the unedifying monotony of the proceedings of the diet, which betrayed continued irritation and yet lacked serious substance. Among the people, meanwhile, a nebulous radical discontent was gaining ground, fostered by Robert Blum and a vast number of lawyers. In tranquil Thuringia, republican phraseology had become current, although dynastic loyalty was no whit impaired. In Weimar, an innocent patriarchal regime was conducted by Grand Duke Charles Frederick, upright but far from intelligent, and his charitable spouse Maria Pavlovna, once celebrated in verse

by Schiller. Duke Bernard Eric Freund's reign in Meiningen was of like character. In Gotha, Ernest II, the young duke, had with much brio inaugurated a liberal regime, which was already proving far too advanced for the landed aristocracy. Game preserving was a frequent cause of damage, and the maintenance of so many royal courts involved expenditure disproportionate to the advantages, but in compensation the whole forest-clad hill region was a well-preserved national park for the delight of the people, and a large proportion of the court expenditure was paternally devoted to the welfare of the country. The Thuringians were quite indifferent to the ludicrousness of these powerless illusory states. What caused unrest in this region was an urge to action fostered by the monotony of the prolonged peace, together with an undisciplined mood which the weak governments were unable to control.

Public life in the south-west had a far more variegated aspect, and for several years this corner of Germany was the focus of the national idea. In 1841 King William of Würtemberg celebrated the twenty-first anniversary of his ascent to the throne. Riding alone through the streets of his capital, he was greeted with thunderous acclamations by the populace. All parts of the country vied one with another in homage and rejoicing; in nearly every district a "William's linden" or a "king's oak" was planted in honour of the occasion; in Stuttgart, plans were afoot for celebrating the anniversary by the erection of a tall Trajan's column in front of the palace. Thenceforward William could count on the gratitude of his people, on whom he had conferred the unquestionable benefits of an orderly and able administration. He was inclined to plume himself on his sagacity, for no other German ruler had had so extensive an experience of constitutional government, so that he would sometimes speak of his ministers patronisingly as "my political pupils." The German courts esteemed him as a prudent sovereign, but he did not inspire personal confidence nor awaken much personal regard. William associated freely with General Rochow, the Prussian envoy, a far more useful person here in the south than he subsequently proved in Russia. The king was delighted that his nephew Prince Augustus had in the Berlin guard become so thorough a Prussian; and it was his ardent wish that Prussia should

replace the decadent Austria as leader of the Germanic Federation. But Rochow knew well enough that the Swabian monarch, when conversing with the Austrian envoy, would use similar depreciatory language concerning Prussia; and the general candidly reported as follows: "The king's personality and doings bear the well-known family stamp of the Würtemberg house."[1]

Freedom of the press, the arming of the nation, publicity of judicial procedure—these were the main points in the new liberal programme which was now making the round of South Germany. King William, however, had long ago broken with the ideas of his youth, and took a severe view of these popular wishes, saying: "Lengthy experience has convinced me that they are impracticable." Freedom of the press in especial was an abomination to him, and it is true that he was a target for scandalous attacks in the lampoons which made their way across the frontier from Switzerland. At this time he had a love relationship with a tragedy actress named Stubenrauch. The affair was not worth wasting words over, for how could any woman rule this cold, dry, selfish man; but the demagogue pamphleteers wrote as if Würtemberg, too, had been governed by a Lola. Speaking of the affair of this baggage, the king used very strong language concerning the press, which, he said, like the brandy-drinking sailor, could in the end content himself with nothing weaker than aqua-fortis. "It will never be possible," said William to Rochow in November, 1842, "to dispense with the censorship, least of all in constitutionalist states." When the Prussian objected, saying that the press must at least have the right to deal with matters of fact, the king made answer: "No, the policy of the federal states is known only to the governmental authorities, and he who is ignorant of the connecting links has no right to express an opinion." Thus in Stuttgart, as elsewhere, a "Never!" had been uttered, though privately, as luck would have it. Here even more speedily than in Berlin and Hanover was it to be refuted by the irresistible march of events. Much as he detested the Abel ministry, the king treated the Würtemberg newspapers no less pettily than that ministry had treated the newspapers of Bavaria. They were not allowed to say a word about Würtemberg

[1] Rochow's Reports, January 12, 1840, September 25, 1843, and subsequent dates.

conditions, though they might rail as they pleased against the great powers. In Prussia, conversely, the instructions to the censorship were that references to foreign affairs were to receive stricter consideration than articles treating of domestic concerns. William was continually lodging complaints because the Swabian liberals, finding no outlet in the Würtemberg papers, would express their sentiments in the *Kölnische Zeitung* or some other Prussian journal. Rochow opined: "One wishes to be spared and yet does not spare others; one complains of others' conduct, and forgets that one is oneself giving occasion for complaint."[1]

The king's only confidant was his old friend Baron von Maucler who, as irresponsible president of the privy council, a purely advisory body, spoke the decisive word in the matter of most official appointments. Minister Schlayer, aided by a staff of carefully chosen and efficient young advisers, presided over the conduct of home affairs, retaining his rigidly bureaucratic methods, but acting cleverly and perspicaciously. Prieser was minister for justice, a severe man, who, like many another unpopular official in South Germany, had received his training as member of the Black Committee in Mainz. Obedience and tranquillity were unconditional demands. This was why the unbelieving king, ever hostile to the clericalists, was likewise inimical to the Hegelians of Tübingen. He looked upon them as disturbers of the peace. Vischer, the æstheticist, was forbidden to lecture for a while because the clergy had raised a clamour owing to the pantheistic tone of the new professor's inaugural address. Yet pettier was the king's conduct in the case of Vischer's colleague Robert Mohl, whose work on *Würtemberg Constitutional Law* had proved him a worthy successor of J. J. Moser. When seeking election to the chamber, Mohl issued to the electors an address not primarily designed for the great public, but freely censuring the errors of the existing system of government. He was thereupon transferred to a minor administrative post. He promptly resigned, and went to Heidelberg, the Swabians thus losing their greatest authority on constitutional law.

In the proceedings of the diet there were persistent repercussions of the violent doings in Hanover. The South German constitutionalists had been indescribably embittered by the Guelph coup d'état. Even Rochow, who was on intimate

[1] Rochow's Reports, November 30, 1842, and February 20, 1843.

terms with Wolfgang Menzel, was influenced by the mood of his entourage. "A German ruler's word will be a thing to mock at," he wrote, if the Federation takes no action in such a matter.[1] But the Bundestag was unteachable. The Swabian opposition was not slow to realise that its withdrawal from the chamber had been a mistake. From 1845 onwards, its members began to resume their seats, Römer, the leading orator in the diet, being one of the first to take this step. In especial he attacked the severities of the censorship. His onslaughts were justified, but again and again he voiced the untenable conclusion that the territorial constitution must take precedence of the federal laws. He was not for that reason a particularist. On the contrary, he kept up a close intercourse with Badenese and Rhenish friends, discussing with them the possibility of putting an end to the deplorable state of affairs that prevailed at the Bundestag. Discontent was rife throughout Würtemberg when Crown Prince Charles was betrothed to the beautiful grand duchess Olga, the rejected of Bavaria and Austria. The heir to the throne, empty-headed and null, utterly unlike his able father, was already in bad repute. When the grand duchess, with girlish exuberance, wrote saying that she hoped to be worthy of him, Rochow, who was intimately acquainted with both bride and bridegroom, exclaimed: "This is really too much! I cannot bring myself to congratulate her." The king, who in earlier years had wedded a grand duchess, now gave no more than a reluctant assent, for the circumstances were utterly different. Amongst the populace, hostility towards this Russian alliance was universally manifest. The czar was by no means deceived by the customary acclamations of the crowd. Again and again he said fiercely to Rochow: "To-day we count for naught in Germany, for the Germans hate us too intensely. In Stuttgart I shall avoid giving any advice on political matters, for this could do nothing but harm." He judged rightly. The Muscovite hegemony against which the press was continually railing existed solely in the imagination of the liberals. Neither King Frederick William, nor the Bundestag, nor any court among the middle-sized states, was guided in domestic affairs by the utterances from St. Petersburg. Nicholas consoled himself for such disagreeable manifestations by the menacing assertion: "If anyone can make use of me, here I am, and I shall

[1] Rochow, Memorial concerning the Hanoverian Constitution, March, 1842.

be glad to help!"[1] All too soon, after the revolution, was the day coming, when the Muscovite devil whom the liberals had so often painted upon the wall, was suddenly to become a living figure.

Now came the years of famine, bringing to Würtemberg —disintegrated, overburdened with debt, and a land of petty proprietorship—terrible poverty and innumerable extensions of coercive government. In May, 1847, a hunger riot occurred at Stuttgart. The king rode forth alone, as he had ridden at the jubilee celebration, hoping that his appearance on the scene would assuage the wrath of the mob. To his dismay, he was met with curses and volleys of stones. Promptly deciding upon resolute action, he led his troops to the attack, and the disturbance was quelled, though not without bloodshed. The king never forgot this hour. Now that personal experience had taught him the caprice of popular favour, he became increasingly confirmed in his harsh contempt for mankind. Greatly incensed, he said subsequently to Radowitz: "What ingratitude after a reign of thirty years!" So blinded was he by anger that he firmly believed Römer, Murschel, and other liberals had planned an extensive revolt, and his only regret was that he could not deal effectively with the traitors.[2] In February, 1848, when Römer alluded to these incidents in the diet, and asked when it was permissible to employ armed force, many of his friends would no longer follow the leader of the opposition, whilst Minister Schlayer rejoined that Römer was practically placing himself upon the side of the revolutionary party. All were trembling at the spectre of revolution, and within a few days the revolution was to break out in Swabia.

In Baden, after Blittersdorff's fall, the government had for a considerable period completely lost its grip. Neither Boeckh, nor yet the learned Nebenius, who was recalled to the ministry, was able to come to terms with the diet. In the high officialdom, behind and beside these figureheads, such declared reactionaries as Rüdt von Collenbach and Rettig were at work; whilst at court secret dissensions continued, for Grand Duke Leopold, in his indecision and weakness, turned

[1] Rochow's Reports, St. Petersburg, January 28, February 4, August 12, and September 14, 1846.

[2] Radowitz' Report, May 27, 1847.

anywhere for advice. Here for the first time in Germany was heard the terrible term "camarilla," which was subsequently to play so great a part in the days of revolution. The peasants of the Black Forest firmly believed that this must be the name of some bad woman. It was impossible, even when one pieced together all the current gossip, to ascertain what this notorious camarilla was aiming at. The only certain fact was that Grand Duchess Sophia was at war with Margrave William, commander of the forces, and it was further apparent that there was a certain amount of ultramontane intrigue going on at the Protestant court. Several of the high court officials were old-time émigrés. When the grand duke's two eldest sons, who were still quite young, visited the court of Vienna in 1843, Blittersdorff advised that Jarcke should act as their teacher in political matters. But their companion, Colonel Roggenbach, paid his respects first to Canitz. The Prussian envoy spoke very frankly, declaring that it would be quite improper to entrust the education of Protestant princes to this fanatical convert, who had instilled Austrian and clericalist ideas into the mind of the young duke of Nassau. The plan was consequently abandoned.[1]

After their triumph over Blittersdorff, the chambers displayed immeasurable self-conceit. Imagining themselves to stand at the head of the German nation, they encouraged the presumption of the populace to such an extent that before long the Badenese demagogues were seriously hoping that from this corner of the fatherland they would be able to impose the German republic upon the rest of the nation. Radowitz reported: "The subversive party throughout Germany looks upon Baden as the terrain on which the principal blow will be delivered."[2] At this epoch the secret final protocol of the Vienna conferences of 1834 was first published in a German-American newspaper, and although the decrees in question had remained utterly void of effect, they were greeted with execration by the entire liberal world. Welcker reprinted the sinister document, appending the complete protocols of the Carlsbad conferences, which he had discovered among Klüber's posthumous papers. For many years this work, *Important Documents relating to the Legal Position of the German Nation* (1844), remained a mine of wealth for liberal polemists, and

[1] Canitz' Report, January 15, 1843.
[2] Radowitz' Report, April 19, 1844.

contributed to destroy the little prestige that was still left to the Bundestag. In a fierce parliamentary oration, Welcker solemnly handed over the Vienna conference decrees "to the divine assize of public opinion." In speech and in writing, he dealt with the ill-treatment of Weidig and Jordan, with the censorship, with the secret protocols of the Bundestag, and with everything that was amiss in the Germanic Federation, so that it seemed at times as if the supreme court of justice of the German nation must be sitting in the Carlsruhe chamber. But the sublime emotion used in referring to the great yearnings of the German people was used also in referring to the petty local grievances of Baden, as for instance the punishment of two citizens who in a public house had "sharply scrutinised a policeman and had indulged in offensive remarks concerning his nose." Von Dusch, the well-intentioned liberal minister, in answer to the admonitions of his conservative neighbour du Thil, responded: "We rule with and through public opinion."[1] In reality, Blittersdorff's harsh bureaucratic regime still persisted almost unchanged. The model censor, Uria-Sarachaja, was at this very time, under the debile administration of Nebenius, acting in the most arbitrary manner. The public were being irritated by numerous indiscretions on the part of the police authorities, especially in Mannheim. In that city the mob of the Neckar surburb, a mob familiarly spoken of as "the Neckar slime" was in any case prone to be unruly; and there on one occasion the communal council, which was in the act of adopting a by no means illegal political resolution, was dispersed by the troops. The government vacillated between semi-liberal inclinations and the timidities of an over-anxious police officer. During the long and stormy sittings of the diet, nothing was in the end brought to fruition beyond the new criminal code, an excellent one, the work of Councillor Jolly.

At this juncture (December, 1845), Zittel, incited thereto by the German Catholic movement, formulated his proposal for having Christian religious parties placed upon an equal footing.[2] The suggestion was unexceptionable, for it demanded little more than what King Frederick William shortly afterwards conceded to the dissenters. But it gave the youthful clericalist party the chance of trying its strength, and of organising in Bavarian

[1] Du Thil's Sketches, Wildbad, May, 1846.
[2] See above, p. 94.

fashion a great Catholic demonstration of popular anger. Professor Buss of Freiburg, an ex-radical, of no account as a professor, but able by his impudence to overawe weakly individuals, was the leader in the underground activities of the priests in the highlands. Major Hennenhofer, the notorious favourite of the late grand duke Louis, likewise emerged from oblivion to support the clericalists of Breisgau. "Religion is in danger," or "Will you remain Catholics?"—such were the war-cries in innumerable pamphlets and public meetings. The peasants of the Black Forest, who had hardly recovered breath since the raging and tearing electoral campaigns of the Blittersdorff era, were suddenly hounded into a fierce religious hunt. It seemed as if all parties in the country had conspired in order to prevent these excitable but good-hearted and well-behaved folk from returning to sanity. On the other side, a clamour was raised by the Jews, the German Catholics, and the growing radical party. When Vicari, the clericalist, recently appointed archbishop, came for the first time to Constance, his supporters had a free fight with their opponents.

Amazed at the storm of clericalist petitions from the highlands, the grand duke now made an almost incredible blunder. In February, 1846, he dissolved the chamber, without any adequate ground, but doubtless hoping to weaken the liberal opposition. His expectation proved utterly fallacious. After another violent electoral campaign, the clericalists gained only one new seat, for which the unlucky Buss was returned. Mathy reminded the professor in the most explicit terms of his radical past, and when Buss repudiated the record, Mathy made so pitiless an exposure of the new member, that henceforward the chamber would hardly allow Buss to speak. The liberals were returned to the diet stronger than ever, and, as was natural, they presented a formidable front against the harassed government. In this chamber it had long been customary to make play with the imminence of revolution, Welcker in especial loving to produce the bugbear in almost every speech. But now Mathy, who never uttered a hasty word, when the motion demanding freedom of the press was brought forward for the ninth time, uttered the following warning: "I cannot banish the anticipation from my mind that while this is the ninth of such motions brought forward in the house, there will not be nine further repetitions. I

believe that the time is not far distant when, by day or by night, for life or for death, the decisive hour will strike." It availed little for Nebenius to speak with indignation of Mathy's "unworthy tone." Even the court was at length beginning to realise that the unmistakable liberal sentiments of the country would be satisfied with nothing short of a liberal ministry. Since Baden was well-to-do, the country was almost entirely free from the hunger riots of these years of scarcity, but the general excitement none the less made itself felt. Even Blittersdorff, in Frankfort, voiced similar opinions, though his hope indeed was that the liberals would soon show their incapacity to govern, and would speedily yield place to a reactionary ministry. Radowitz likewise, whose advice was again asked by the grand duke, did not positively oppose the plan, although he still cherished the illusion that a change in the constitution could be secured by legal means.[1] The decisive point was that Nebenius himself wished to entrust the guidance of the state to more vigorous hands.

At length, in December, 1846, Councillor Bekk, who had for some years been a member of the ministry, became leader of the government. An able lawyer, an effective parliamentary orator of moderate liberal views, and a sincere Catholic, he belonged to the good old official school of Winter, and had acquired universal respect by justice and kindliness. The worst excesses of the censors and the police authorities now ceased. Thanks to Bekk, the cultured classes regained confidence in the state authority, in so far as this was possible in the disordered and distracted land of Baden. Had it not been for this conciliatory regime, initiated unfortunately too late, Baden would probably have succumbed to anarchy as early as the spring of 1848.

As a result of Bekk's tenure of office, for the first time in any German state there began a segregation of the liberal party from the radical. Everywhere, hitherto, those who were adverse to the dominant system had without distinction been classed as belonging to the opposition. In Prussia, Dahlmann and Jacoby, Vincke and H. Simon, were still generally regarded as persons of the same way of thinking, for the radical party had been quite unrepresented in the united diet, and had therefore never shown its colours. In Baden, too, during the wild electoral campaigns, the liberals had accepted any and every

[1] Radowitz' Report, December 10, 1846.

offer of help. Side by side with the experienced leaders, there were now seated in the diet a certain number of youthful democrats, such as Brentano, a shrewd pettifogger, Hecker, the fiery orator, who in his student days had been nicknamed "the lout," and several others. But as soon as the government began to work honestly in accordance with the spirit of the constitution, it grew plain that many of the dreaded older parliamentarians, who in Radowitz' reports had almost all been stigmatised as demagogues, were in reality persons of very moderate views. As long as the liberals had been members of an opposition with no prospects they had, naturally enough, often kicked over the traces. Now, however, Bassermann admitted that he was weary of sterile controversy, and that he would be happy to support an upright constitutionalist government. A few weeks after the electoral campaign of 1846 Mathy said: "The people is more modest in its demands than are those coteries which during the elections were endeavouring to falsify the expression of popular views." Nor was Welcker the truculent fellow he was represented to be by the mortified federal envoys. One of dispassionate mind looking back into the past is apt to form unjust judgments concerning the commonplaces of parliamentary speakers, for we have to remember that triviality is, after all, the most trustworthy method for making a political idea common property. Without the incessant repetitions in Welcker's fierce orations, a conviction of the untenability of the federal constitution would never have been so widely diffused. But the old blusterer's utmost ambition was to see the establishment of a German parliament. Among the new members of the diet, the most notable accession to the ranks of middle-class liberalism was von Soiron, a capable and eloquent lawyer from Mannheim.

Struve led the fight from the other wing of what had been the united opposition, and the struggle was soon waged with all the venom of estranged brothers. Embittered by the long campaign against the "model censor," Struve had become a radical extremist; and in his new periodical, the *Deutsche Zuschauer*, he thundered against the Laodiceans, the parade-ground heroes, the parliamentary mandarins. Those whom Struve termed the "wholehearted" secured recruits in the young Carl Blind and in many foreign agents, who easily made their way into this frontier territory. At the same time,

the garbage of the Swiss and Parisian press crossed the Rhine daily. The French communists' term of abuse "bourgeois" became current in Baden, where it was absolutely unmeaning. At a radical meeting held in Offenburg (September, 1847), in addition to the customary popular wishes the demand was voiced for a settlement between capital and labour. This was the herald of the socialist movement. Radowitz wrote despairingly of "the utterly infected atmosphere" of Baden. He further anticipated disaster from the renewed toleration of the freemasons' lodges, which indeed in Baden, as in all Catholic countries, had a much more definitely liberal tendency than they displayed in the Protestant north. But Frederick William, influenced by the traditions of his house, could not accept without protest Radowitz' characterisation of freemasonry, and his tart comment was: "What preposterous ignorance of the true significance of freemasonry!! Let those who wish to know what a freemasons' lodge is, join one!"[1] After manifold disputes and attempts at reconciliation, an open breach between the two parties at length occurred at the supplementary elections in the autumn of 1847, when Struve and several of his radical friends lost their seats.

Thus began a clarification of the party system. The change had long been impending, but unfortunately it came far too late for the German nation to be enlightened by it in time to save the situation. No one suffered from the squalls of this new epoch more severely than old Adam von Itzstein whose diplomatic skill had hitherto enabled him to harmonise all the energies of the opposition. It was now his fate to see his ablest followers diverge rightwards while he himself was directed towards the left by the power of his own radical phrases, a thousand times repeated. Henceforward he was a dead man. The sharpness of the new party contrasts was conspicuously displayed during the opening weeks of 1848, when the three leading factories of the country, those at Waghäusel, Ettlingen, and Carlsruhe, were gravely endangered by the ruin of the great Haber banking firm and by other misfortunes, and when the government proposed to render them financial aid, Mathy, so recently dreaded as a demagogue, strongly supported the ministerial proposal. Hecker, on the other hand, handed in a petition from sixty-three workmen, confronting power for power the sixty-three deputies, and

[1] Radowitz' Reports, January 4 and August 6, 1847.

defiantly prohibiting a step which would favour capital. The liberals, meanwhile, were discussing the future of the Germanic Federation. All now believed that it was about to collapse, and no one could suggest any certain way of salvation. The thought which, a year and a half earlier, Welcker had voiced in the Badenese chamber was regarded by all as an indisputable truth; it was felt that the Bundestag could not possibly continue to exist without the cooperation of popular energies. The revolution had not yet broken out when on February 12, 1848, in a powerful speech, Bassermann formulated his proposal for the summoning of a German parliament: "The peace of the world hangs in the balance. On the Seine and on the Danube the end draws on amain, and good and justice alone are the supporters of dominion."

Du Thil, whose tenure of office had been longer than that of any other German minister, regarded with neighbourly enmity these Badenese, who were continually disseminating unrest in the comparatively tranquil land of Hesse, above all through the instrumentality of the audacious Mannheim press. Now that the persecution of the demagogues had at length been brought to a close, he ruled quietly in his customary manner, which was reasonable, honest, and careful, but rigidly bureaucratic. He had succeeded in developing to the highest conceivable perfection the system of official parliamentarism peculiar to the south-west. In the year 1845, of the fifty deputies comprising the lower house, thirty-four were state officials and eight were communal officials. Seeing that in Hesse official discipline was far more strictly enforced than in Baden, the unlucky remainder of untitled popular representatives, eight in number, could effect practically nothing. As far as German politics were concerned, and especially in the negotiations relating to the customs union, du Thil was invariably a loyal adherent of the Prussian cause. Even Zimmermann, the liberal court chaplain, secured the king of Prussia's approval, for he had voted for the expulsion of Rupp the freethinker from the Gustavus Adolphus Union. When "certain obscurantists" sent the prelate a dead bat by post, Frederick William issued instructions as follows: "This anecdote must be sent to the newspapers, with the addition of a word or two anent the Pro-Ruppians, the seemliness of their behaviour, and their general sentiments." [1]

[1] Bockelberg's Report, November 2, 1845, with Marginal Notes.

The clever minister found it by no means easy to maintain a policy favourable to Prussia. Prince Emilius, brother to Louis II, and far more intelligent than the well-meaning grand duke, had served as a general under Napoleon,[1] and was naturally hostile to the Prussian army, above all to the first man in that army, the prince of Prussia. Were it necessary to seek help from either of the two German great powers, Emilius, being an ultra-conservative, would prefer that his Rhenish Confederate land should receive protection from Austria. Russian influence had likewise been at work underground since Princess Maria had married Grand Duke Alexander, heir to the czarist throne. Prince August Wittgenstein, acknowledged favourite of Prince Emilius, rough, uncultured, stable-bred, but energetic and clever and half Russian by descent, zealously advocated Muscovite and reactionary ideas at court. Only in Hesse-Darmstadt, and in the adjoining state of Nassau where the young Duke Adolphus had recently wedded a grand duchess, did Czar Nicholas continue to exercise a certain amount of influence. His Prussian brother-in-law remained deaf to all exhortations, and other German courts universally harboured mistrust of the St. Petersburg cabinet. Meanwhile the ultramontane party was casting its nets over the grand duchy. The minister was not blind to what was going on, and was delighted when some one anonymously forwarded him from Schaffhausen a writing entitled *The Operations of the Ultramontane and Absolutist Party in South Germany.* The booklet obviously emanated from the circles of the liberal priesthood. It displayed a thorough knowledge of details, and showed how firmly established clericalist influence already was at the courts of the south. In Hesse, Chancellor Linde was the main buttress of clericalism. Linde had been born in the Westphalian duchy of Electoral Cologne. When this region passed under the sway of Prussia, misliking his new fatherland he had accepted a call to Giessen, doing good service there as professor of law, and subsequently becoming chancellor of the university. Thereafter he filled various high offices of state, and founded the Catholic faculty of Giessen, which rivalled Freiburg and Tübingen in promoting the scientific education of the clergy in South-West Germany. Since he never completely abandoned respect for his former teacher Hermes, he remained suspect to the strict ultramontanes, but

[1] See Appendix XXXIX, and refer to vol. III, p. 375.

he collaborated with them none the less, prizing them as irreconcilable opponents of Prussia. Every man of strong character exercises both an attractive and a repellent influence, an assertion applying no less to states than to individuals. Just as the Prussian state had ever attracted to itself men of exceptional talent from other parts of Germany, fulfilling them with the Prussian spirit, it was equally natural that the clericalist party of the south should draw the most prussophobe of its adherents from Prussia herself—Görres, Jarcke, Phillips, and Linde. When Archduke Max of Austria-Este, a man of great wealth, and unostentatiously a powerful patron of the Jesuits, visited the German south-west, his first step in Hesse was to see Linde, for, as du Thil bitterly remarked, "he knew where to apply." In Biebrich, likewise, where Jarcke had been at work, a clericalist court party centred round Baron von Loë, and aimed at snatching power from the nepotist group comprised by the members of the powerful family of Dungern (a group familiarly known as the Nassau Rattenkönig).

Amid these numerous factions at court du Thil was strong enough to take his own course. He possessed the grand duke's complete confidence, and in the relationships between Hesse and the other states he continued with the old zeal to maintain the dignity of the princely house. Great was the delight when, after a contest lasting many years, he was at length able to secure that Hesse-Homburg was not to have any share in the Bundestag vote of the Darmstadt cousins, but must content herself with a place among the pygmies of the sixteenth curia. In default of this arrangement the grand-ducal integral vote would have been "degraded" to become a curiate vote! Jaup, the veteran president, who had collaborated in the establishment of the constitution but had subsequently been placed on the retired list as a suspect, was reckoned the most dangerous man of the opposition. Though Jaup was no more than a moderate liberal, owing to the "cynical simplicity" of his demeanour he was regarded at court as a sinister demagogue, and it was found possible for a number of years to keep him out of the chamber. When he was at length reelected in 1847, though he had for some time been retired, the government refused him furlough, and he was therefore again excluded from the diet. "Never," said the grand duke once to du Thil, "shall I permit Herr Jaup to be forced

upon me as a minister. Ere this can happen I shall have abdicated." [1] Little did he suspect how soon this prophecy was to be literally fulfilled. The German Catholic movement disclosed to the light of day the struggles of faction which had been secretly going on at court. Prince Emilius and Linde demanded that the new sect should be suppressed, and Linde attacked it in impassioned writings, but du Thil, following Prussia's example, contented himself with milder measures. Owing to these dissensions, Linde resigned in December, 1847, but he was soon to renew the struggle against Prussia upon a grander stage.

The tranquil proceedings of the diet did not become enlivened until the government brought forward a new civil code, modelled to a considerable extent upon the *code Napoléon.* But the divergencies were reason enough for the Rhenish Hessians to give renewed manifestations of their ancient detestation for the Starkenburgers of the right bank, since they were unwilling to spare a single letter from the sacred codex of the foreign conqueror. Fostered by the new Rhenish Union, a vigorous political movement now began on the left bank. The town council of Mainz, in a petition to the grand duke, was not ashamed to declare that the *code Napoléon* was a link of union between the Rhenish Hessians and fifty millions of Belgians and French, and that the code must consequently be introduced upon the right bank as well. Since the diet none the less adopted the new draft, the Rhenish Hessians were profoundly mortified. Mainz once again showed itself to be the city of political clubs. Cheers for the French were raised in every tavern, whilst the radical beer-swillers were continually at feud with the Prussians of the federal garrison, whom they detested as the foes of France. Through this Rhenish-Hessian embroglio, Heinrich von Gagern was recalled to public life. For fully ten years he had held aloof from the chambers, since the day when he had solemnly enquired, "Where for us is there anything that resembles freedom?" He now rushed into the fray with a writing on behalf of *The Legal System of Rhenish Hesse.* It was assuredly a sign of hopelessly corrupt conditions that so excellent a German patriot should become a defender of foreign law. Amid the chaos of particularism, it was in truth a possible subject of controversy, which variety of legal uniformity was preferable.

[1] Du Thil's Sketches.

the French uniformity of the left bank of the Rhine or the semifrench uniformity of the Hesse-Darmstadt realm. In 1846 Gagern was returned to the Reichstag, where he immediately became involved in a fierce personal dispute with Georgi, who had been examining judge in the Weidig trial. Since Georgi was universally despised, the weakly opposition naturally hailed Gagern, a handsome and chivalrous man, as its leader. But he had never concealed the fact that he regarded himself as a German first and as a Hessian only second. Like his friend Wernher of Nierstein, he foresaw the collapse of the Bundestag, and was endeavouring to come to an understanding concerning the future of the great fatherland with men of similar sentiments in neighbouring territories.

§ 2. CONGRESSES OF SAVANTS. PRUSSIA'S PLANS FOR FEDERAL REFORM.

While the minds of the people were in a ferment, and practically no one believed in the durability of the existing order, the Bundestag sank deeper and deeper into decay. In its last throes, this institution was to show how ripe it was for the destruction. Since all danger of war had vanished, the federal states, with the solitary exception of Prussia, had resumed their criminal attitude of indifference towards the question of adequate military protection for the fatherland. A second federal inspection of the forces, undertaken in the year 1846, served only to prove how little effect the first one had had. The Luxembourgeois contingent was still "very far from having been formed." For the rest, the new regulations were destined to bring forth naught but fresh and unworthy quarrels. Each sovereign power, even when it possessed no general of its own, was fain to enjoy the pleasure of inspecting the troops of other states. The senates of Hamburg and Lübeck declared emphatically: "Together with Oldenburg we constitute a brigade, and we pay contributions towards a general of brigade; consequently we must be accounted as participating in the inspection of troops serving with the colours—were it only by an et cætera, and in succession on the list to Oldenburg." But against this "et cætera" Oldenburg protested with all the pride of the house of Gottorp.[1]

[1] Dönhoff's Reports, June 25 and July 6, 1846.

Frederick William desired that the federal flag should fly from the towers of the federal fortresses, and that the ordnance should be adorned with the arms of the Germanic Federation. The court of Vienna had, naturally, nothing to say against the idea of the traditional yellow-and-black banner of the empire floating from the ramparts of Ulm and Rastatt. It was equally natural that King Louis of Bavaria should be adverse. He proposed the adoption of the black-red-and-gold colours of the Burschenschaft, in order "to deprive the revolutionary parties of a weapon"; [1] yet he must have known beforehand that nothing would come of the suggestion. The discussions concerning the federal coat-of-arms were happier in their result. Some of the smaller states wished to see the escutcheons of the eight-and-thirty sovereign powers tastefully combined, with the superscription: "Union is beneficial." But it soon appeared how inappropriate was this device. The order of precedence of the various coats-of-arms had long been a bone of contention, and the unanimity which was essential for such an "organic decree" was not to be hoped for. It was therefore necessary to fall back upon the double eagle, which had served as arms for the Holy Roman Empire during the centuries of its decline. But Obercamp, the Bavarian federal envoy, objected: "The eagle has never been a German national emblem; it has come down to us from heathendom as the symbol of Roman imperialism and world dominion." After lengthy discussion Bavaria gave in. The eagle could not, however, bear a crown, nor a sceptre, nor a sword, for that would have encroached too much upon the sovereignty of the federal states. King Frederick William had the following message conveyed to the Bundestag through his envoy: "The disarmed imperial eagle upon the ramparts of the federal fortresses is likely to be the occasion for a vast amount of merriment on the part of the French; I am really happy to have had no share in the decision." [2] When Prussia thereupon volunteered to provide the 1,450 men which Waldeck and the two Lippes were to have furnished for the garrisoning of Luxemburg, and, in order to do this, proposed to withdraw the three armies occupying the fortresses of Wesel and Minden (where they were much safer), the three princes declared with

[1] Dönhoff's Report, June 24, 1846.

[2] Dönhoff's Report, May 7; Gise, Instruction to the embassy in Berlin, June 5, 1846.

one voice: "This suggestion is unbecoming, seeing that in Luxemburg the troops are under the command of a federal general"—who happened to be a Prussian—"whereas in Wesel and in Minden the troops are at the disposal of a neighbour state." [1]

Still profounder was the mortification of the pygmies when Frederick William declared himself willing to close the only Prussian gaming house, which was in Aix-la-Chapelle, and when he further demanded that the Federation should in future forbid the keeping of any public places of the kind. Every spa in the vicinity of Frankfort had a flourishing gaming hell; all the rogues of Europe bided tryst in these places; the Parisian boulevardier reckoned that "Hombourg" and "Bade-Bade" were simply parts of France; and our eastern neighbours, not without justice, jeeringly declared that in these gaming resorts the foreigner could test the achievements of the far-famed German civilisation. The monstrous growth had struck deep roots. Benazet, the farmer of the gaming house in Baden, and Blanc in Homburg, took equal rank with the representative of the great commercial houses with the Rothschilds, the Cottas, and the Taxis, who enjoyed especial favour in the Eschenheimer Gasse. They were in close relationship with Blittersdorff and other federal envoys; they furnished substantial revenues to their petty rulers; and they were held in high esteem by the inhabitants of the various spas as benefactors of the whole countryside. The Prussian envoy, Count Dönhoff, was soon to learn into what a hornets' nest he had stumbled. Nassau was willing to do away with the small gaming hells of Schlangenbad and Schwalbach, but the great place in Ems must continue in existence as long as the one in Homburg was maintained. Baden and Homburg indignantly rejected the idea; first let all the games of lotto and the state lotteries be cleared from off the German soil.[2] The squabble, which lasted several years, ended at last in abolishing one only of the great German gaming houses, the one in Coethen, and this died a natural death, for, after the extinction of the Coethen line, the territory was incorporated into Dessau (1847). In such circumstances occurred the disappearance of the most remarkable of the German principalities, a land which had developed with rare perfection the galaxy of charms

[1] Dönhoff's Report, April 3, 1847.
[2] Dönhoff's Reports, January 7, 1845, and subsequent dates.

peculiar to German particularism. What a succession of marvels had Coethen brought forth within the last forty years! First the *Moniteur de l'Empire Anhaltin-Coethien*, then the great smuggling war with Prussia, subsequently the Jesuit headquarters in the very midst of an Old Protestant country, and finally the gaming house. What more could the eulogists of German polyarchy desire?

Amid these trivialities were the long days allowed to flit away in Frankfort. "The Bundestag is a corpse, a fraud; the Bundestag is the point of indifference in German politics." Such was the unanimous criticism divulged by the reports of the envoys. Metternich, however, for whom the Federation should have been a jewel of price, continued to treat the assembly in the Eschenheimer Gasse with the utmost contempt. Münch's colleagues calculated that of his twenty-three years' term of office the presidential envoy had passed thirteen in Vienna, and ten merely in Frankfort; whilst in recent times the ratio had been even less favourable. Everywhere in Germany (and the fact was admitted by the federal envoys) the future of the fatherland was discussed. A notable exception was Frankfort. A frenzy of rejoicing was spreading through the whole land, and yet how little cause for rejoicing existed. Like the Italians, a people of kindred destiny, the Germans were joyfully anticipating the time when they would constitute a single nation. Numberless fraternal gatherings took place. The congresses of natural philosophers were followed in quick succession by meetings of philologists, agriculturists, lawyers, singers, and men of letters. The new tricolor of Schleswig-Holstein was jubilantly acclaimed wherever it was hoisted; nay, even the black-red-and-gold banner, despised of the Bundestag, floated once more in the breeze, notwithstanding the prohibition. This flag was already accounted the national emblem.

Two only of these assemblies produced durable results. The first, a congress of Teutonists, was inaugurated by the Swabian L. Reyscher, and was held in Frankfort and in Lübeck during the years 1846 and 1847 respectively. They were acclaimed as the "intellectual diets of the German people," for the flower of the professordom had foregathered on each occasion. Men of learning acquired great political prestige through the Guelph coup d'état and the Schleswig-Holstein struggle, and, besides, were taking their part in the vital

questions affecting the nation as a whole by bringing all the resources of their scientific training and attainments to bear upon the discussions of the day. No other platform was as yet open to the Germans, and it was merely the determinism of history which caused the participants in these spiritual diets to be chosen, alas all too often, to become representatives in the real parliaments of a later date. In Frankfort, the Schleswig-Holstein question was so ably elucidated by Dahlmann, Waitz, and Droysen, that ever since it has hardly been possible to cast a doubt upon the "good right" of our northern march. At the congress held in Lübeck, a provisional and "theoretic agreement" was arrived at in respect of the time-honoured dispute concerning the reform of criminal procedure; even Georg Beseler, who shortly before in his book on *Folk Law and Lawyers' Law* had combated the quietism of the historical school and had championed the Old German court of legal experts (Schöffengericht), became converted to Dahlmann's very debatable conclusion—which, however, had the approval of the majority in the gathering—that trial by jury was the most sterling means for the political education of the people. The professors were thus in agreement with popular wishes. Happy were the days passed at these congresses! An enthusiasm that was ardent and brimful of hope rejuvenated even the elderly. Uhland seemed to see the old emperors springing lifelike from the picture frames as he listened to the patriotic eloquence of the congressists in the ancient Roman hall at Frankfort. In the Lübeck Rathaus the venerable Jacob Grimm, overpowered by his feelings, threw himself into Dahlmann's arms, exclaiming: "Never have I loved anything so dearly as my fatherland." Far too soon was time to stride with iron-shod feet over these innocent effusions. The professors themselves realised this. They determined to collaborate in a work on the most recent events in German history, an undertaking which would certainly have awakened the nation to a realisation of its newest acquisitions, and would have sharpened its understanding of coming events. But the plan was frustrated by the revolution; only a few fragments, such as the *Life of Stein* by Pertz, and Wippermann's *History of Electoral Hesse*, were ever completed.

Such gatherings were mere preliminaries; but the friendly consultations which took place incessantly between the liberal deputies of western Germany during these years had more

direct influence upon the politics of the day. The indecision and discord prevailing at the courts constrained the people to look for federal reform from below. In October, 1847, there assembled in Heppenheim some of the most notable liberals of the west: Mathy, Bassermann, and Soiron from Baden; Römer from Würtemberg; Hergenhahn from Nassau; Heinrich von Gagern from Hesse; Hansemann and Mevissen from Prussian Rhineland; even old Itzstein put in an appearance, though he soon realised that his voice counted for little among these moderates. The question of the German parliament, a question which synthesised the wishes of the whole nation, was earnestly discussed; and as soon as matters came to be analysed the further question forced itself imperiously upon the attention: Prussia or Austria? Mathy, in his thoughtful way, concluded that a national assembly in the absence of a veritable state authority would be an absurdity; nay, that the existence of such an assembly alongside the Bundestag would put the finishing touch to German anarchy. The customs union, on the other hand, already possessed a common administration and a tolerable organisation; it was therefore essential that a customs parliament should be formed out of the customs conferences, so that important national affairs might be seriously discussed and not be dissipated in empty phrases. This whole idea was a word of deliverance. Should the trail be followed further the inevitable conclusion would be that the only way to achieve German unity was to place the nation under Prussian leadership, to the exclusion of Austria. Gagern agreed with the Badenese spokesman; Hansemann, who had already recommended to the Rhenish provincial diet and to the united diet the summoning of a customs parliament, followed suit. The conference dispersed in fullest concord. But soon after the return home these men came to realise that the sober idea of a customs parliament was far from satisfying the patriots who ardently yearned after some vague happiness and whose minds had been profoundly stirred. "A German parliament"; this was the rallying cry of the unity party, the one cry that could stimulate the broad masses of the people. Knowing this, Bassermann proposed in the Carlsruhe chamber that a united German representative assembly should be summoned. But Bassermann was too clear-headed to ignore how little such a nebulous proposition really touched the kernel of the matter.

Previously, in July, 1847, an enterprise had been set afoot to secure that the moderate liberals should in future be the intellectual leaders of national politics. Ever since his accession the king of Prussia had been busied upon the creation of a great newspaper that should voice the longings of the entire nation. Though the idea was now taken up by Professor Lohbauer, it was foredoomed to failure. Where could journalists be found who should combine, as Frederick William wished them to combine, a liberal outlook with the outlook of the Berlinese court? This cherished notion was now ruthlessly wrenched from the royal hands by the Badenese liberals. They had resolved at the Durlach meeting of 1846 to found a great newspaper entitled the *Deutsche Zeitung*. Bassermann undertook the publication through his bookshop in Mannheim; Gervinus acted as editor, and not only did his unquenchable zeal succeed in attracting a quite unprecedented number of subscribers, but the journal could soon count among its contributors all the best names representative of moderate liberalism in southern and western Germany. Dahlmann alone hesitated, for he held that "Prussian soil should bear the thing which was to strike its roots in Prussia." Gervinus, on the other hand, with particularist arrogance, was of opinion that the south was destined to introduce its own constitutionalist spirit into Prussia, was destined to be the permanent leader in German political life, whereas Prussia was merely to develop what had been introduced from without. Though the radicals jeered at the "professors' journal" before ever it appeared, the *Deutsche Zeitung* published an astonishing number of maturely considered leading articles; even the news items had a doctrinaire flavour, a peculiarity which the editor attempted to excuse by saying: "Our supply of news is not yet wholly systematised." Splendid contributions were sent in by innumerable statesmen, deputies, and professors. Among the first collaborators some deserve especial mention: Mathy, with his alert journalistic flair; Ludwig Häusser, a young Alsatian, professor of history at Heidelberg. This young man united in his person all the fine characteristics of the South German race; sound common sense, blithesome energy, ardent enthusiasm, and an amiability which sometimes won over his very opponents. Later on, the *Deutsche Zeitung* was to be the training ground of many a stalwart journalist, such men as Kruse, Aegidi, Heller, and Marggraff.

The *Deutsche Zeitung* worked (as subsequently the *Kreuzzeitung* alone was able to work with success) for the thorough cultivation of a definite party opinion. At first its influence was confined to a small circle. Nearly all the worthy professors who in the days of the Frankfort parliament were to decide the issues, the advocates of constitutional monarchy and of Prussian hegemony, acknowledged that the articles in this journal were in part responsible for their political culture. But the *Deutsche Zeitung* never succeeded in effecting an entry among the mass of the reading public. From its birth the paper hovered in the air; for neither did it have a particularist standing-ground, nor did it represent the interests of a powerful class. The tone of the essays, too, was usually above the readers' heads, and the editorial staff rejected with scorn the idea of stimulating interest by introducing sensational novelties. The worst blow of all was that the *Deutsche Zeitung* had so few collaborators and readers among the Prussians. Even old Schön, though he had allowed his revered name to be placed among the announcements, never contributed a line. Privy Councillor Fallenstein was a member of the editorial committee in Heidelberg. He had been in the Lützow yagers in early manhood, and had risen in the Prussian state service after a youth passed in terrible penury. Quite recently he had quitted the service, for he was profoundly discontented with Kühne's dictatorial ways. Fallenstein was one of those rare men who achieve things by the power of an elemental personality rather than by their actual deeds; he possessed the energy of a primitive Teuton, was staunch, candid, and frugal, as were all the stalwarts of Blucher's day. He remained on terms of close intimacy with Gervinus; but the Prussian was often sorely tried when day after day the *Deutsche Zeitung*, in spite of its professed love for Prussia, would belabour that country, and would give lessons in wisdom and virtue without any real knowledge of the matter in hand. Gervinus once offered an apology on behalf of the paper: "Our warmest criticism of Prussia is but a token of our warm love." But constant discourtesy cannot demonstrate love. In the long run, Prussian politics could not be preached outside of Prussia; and it was only human that King Frederick William, whose whole outlook was so aloof from liberalism, should regard as his sworn foe the "Mannheimer and Heppenheimer" and its carping criticism. "Prussia has become a wholly German

state." This oft-repeated phrase was the greatest service rendered by the *Deutsche Zeitung*, though except in professorial circles the new doctrine secured little approval.

The futility of the Bundestag appeared so hopeless that even Blittersdorff was constrained to advise the consideration of reforms. He had never been a whole-hearted particularist, for he had always desired a strong federal policy. In his impatient ambition he went so far as to endeavour to come to an understanding with Count Dönhoff, and informed the count that in view of Austria's incurable indifference no other course was left open than for the lesser states to unite with Prussia. This change in an old opponent was, however, too suspicious; even the king, usually so guileless, warned his envoy: "This may well be a trap, for Herr von B. is doubtless capable of setting one."[1] Thus fobbed off by Prussia, Blittersdorff turned once more to the beloved Austria; and, from the autumn of 1847 onwards, he besieged Count Münch with a long series of memorials which all went to prove, however reluctantly and for this very reason irrefutably, that the Hofburg could succeed in extending its sway over Germany in no other way than by fraud and by stretching the law. Without mincing his words, Blittersdorff affirmed that Austria could not tolerate "a national Germany with a central motive force," and was debarred from entering into the customs union; consequently, he concluded, the Viennese court, by an adroit use of the meaningless article 64 of the Vienna final act, must place all the separate treaties entered into by the various federal states anent customs, coinage, postal service, etc., "under the protection of the Bundestag," and must further take into its own hand the "political conduct" of all the affairs relative to the common weal of Germany, and in especial all the affairs of the customs union. How disingenuous an admission! The Hofburg was not to be hampered by any of the duties pertaining to the German customs union, but the right of dominion was to be accorded Austria, in order that "a national Germany" should never come into being! The inequality of the compact between Austria and Germany could not have been more obviously laid bare. Luckily all these labours bore no fruit. Neither Metternich nor his debile old colleague at the Bundestag could ever decide upon energetic action. When du Thil recommended to Count Münch that he should help in

[1] Dönhoff's Report, April 8, 1845, with marginal note.

the pursuance of federal reform, or at least should insist upon a better carrying out of the existing federal law, the Austrian replied: "Why should I, after the slavery of so many years, run the risk at last of becoming thoroughly unpopular and decried by everyone?" But the Hessian reflected with foreboding: "Après nous le déluge!" [1]

The proposals for reform which emanated from Prince Carl von Leiningen were far more honest in tenour. He was a half-brother of Queen Victoria and had spent part of his youth in England. Here he had acquired varied experience and knowledge, and had learned at first hand to appreciate the blessings of national unity. Like the majority of the mediatised princes, he contemplated the German dynasts with a sceptical air, for, he argued, why should the houses of Lippe and Reuss be more inviolable than the Leiningens and the Fürstenbergs? Since he decorously filled the presidential seat in the Bavarian senate he believed himself capable of dealing with the great tasks of national politics. For his misfortune, this devoted patriot lacked repose, steadfastness of purpose, and unremitting diligence. His work was shapeless, half matured; it betrayed the careless hand of the aristocratic dilettante. In an enthusiastic memorial he urged his mediatised colleagues to renounce in a propitious hour the hateful taxes and patrimonial rights which they still possessed, and thereby to assure to themselves a place in the diets which would secure for them a position of political power and importance.[2] In two other essays he considered the German question, and openly declared his faith in Prussia's hegemony; it seemed to be his intention to allot to the Hofburg a purely honorary position. The sovereignty of the German dynasties, which had at one time been earnestly championed, was now, he argued, so seriously undermined, partly by the customs union, partly by the creation of representative assemblies and by the officialdom, and, in a word, by the growing power of the middle class, that it could not possibly endure any further curtailment. The princes must, therefore, seize upon the two most vital elements of the time, namely, the idea of constitutional freedom and the idea of nationality; they must lead the nation forward to this goal; must recognise the preponderance of Prussian influence, and yet at the same time must impose definite

[1] Du Thil's Sketches, June, 1846.
[2] Prince von Leiningen, Memorial concerning the Mediatised, Spring, 1846.

limits upon this preponderance. "But how," continued the prince thoughtfully, "if Prussia herself were to take the lead in political matters, and, adopting as her own the ideals and aspirations of the middle class which is daily increasing in strength, were suddenly to show the weary German nation that the goal is close at hand?"[1]

The prince sent one of these memorials, which were soon to be found at the Bundestag and at the lesser courts, to his brother-in-law Prince Albert; and the prince consort thereupon proceeded, with all the effrontery of a counterfeit Englishman, to give King Frederick William a lecture on German politics. Marvellous indeed was the world of self-deception in which this lucky Coburger passed his days! The ludicrous impotence of the English kingship, scantily veiled beneath a hypocritical court etiquette, entirely escaped his notice; and Duke Ernest of Coburg remarked in all seriousness that his brother's position was "an excellent counterpart to that of the king of Prussia." The German cosmopolitans were willing to tolerate a display of insolence which the members of no other nation would have countenanced in those who had adopted a new fatherland. Just as our liberals gratefully accepted instruction from the German-Americans, so it happened that our courts deemed it not undignified that this Coburger, who had light-heartedly turned his back upon the fatherland, should still wish to have a say in German affairs. What would Queen Victoria have thought if King Frederick William, assuming the tone of a dominie, had proffered advice concerning the home politics of Great Britain? Such a simple query never occurred to the unpretentious Germans. Prince Albert was far more sympathetic to the particularist ideas of the dynasts than was his brother-in-law; and, indeed, the notion of Prussian hegemony was specially distasteful to him. He therefore adopted as his own some of the best thoughts from the Leiningen memorial, though he was careful to deprive them of their edge. He urged, as did his brother-in-law, the introduction of constitutional government and the creation of a united Germany; but though he admitted that Austria blocked every reform, he nevertheless proposed that Prussia should act in concert with Austria, and should endeavour so to fortify the Bundestag

[1] Prince von Leiningen, two Memorials anent Germany's situation. Undated. Probably written in January and in July, 1846.

that all the customs, postal, and coinage unions could be assembled under federal protection in Frankfort—of course with the aid of elected representatives and with full publicity. His advice accorded in the end with Blittersdorff's Austrian memorials; though, with singular contradiction, he continually returned to the stipulation that Prussia alone should lead in the Frankfort policy of reform. How was this miracle possible? How was Prussia to secure a trustworthy majority in Frankfort? To these questions Prince Albert vouchsafed no answer. The memorial dated Ardverikie, September 11, 1847, though it attained great notoriety in the circles of the author's cousins, was after all a mediocre piece of work. It served only to prove once again that a man without a fatherland is no longer competent to understand the politics of his native country.

With ponderous candour, for at the English court he could speak his mind freely, Lord Palmerston declared his antagonism to the prince consort's suggestions. He certainly wished the Germans everything that was good, and glibly reiterated the time-honoured patter about the natural alliance between England and Germany. But he would hear nothing of German customs unity; no English minister, he solemnly declared, could ever countenance the entry of Hanover and of the Hansa towns into the customs union; the free trade coast of western Germany, declared the Briton, was the only route by which manufactured goods could be smuggled into Germany. The pity was that this frank admission was not more widely known in the fatherland. Even the trusty Stockmar, who was at that time in Coburg, was uneasy; his German pride, which, despite his anomalous international position, he never disavowed, rebelled against the obtrusiveness of the prince consort, and he wrote frankly: "He who has for so long absented himself from the fatherland has no right to take an active part in its counsels." Stockmar then made a strong appeal to his favourite pupil, whose unbending dynastic pride he knew but too well, to search his conscience, to bethink himself that what the German princely houses most urgently needed at the time was a true knowledge of themselves, for it was they who through treachery and undiscipline had destroyed the old empire, had wrought disintegration in the fatherland. These princely houses were hated by a large part of the nation, which accounted them the greatest foes of German unity. It was time the

sovereigns should realise that anti-dynastic sentiments were spreading through ever wider circles . . . Golden words! But the prince was not to be persuaded. Through Bunsen's instrumentality he despatched both his own and his brother-in-law's memorials to the Berlin court.

It was soon to be made plain that the policy of breaking loose from Austria (acclaimed as the sole means of salvation), that the return to the Frederician policy, was to no one more repugnant than to King Frederick William. As he wrote to Bunsen, Leiningen's proposals "wellnigh angered me. . . . My brother-in-law wishes cautiously to detach Austria from the Federation; he desires to create a federation within the federation that it may act against the federation (a breach of faith!); and I am to be quasi forced to agree to such machinations, to forward the aspirations of these liberal jackasses, and to raise the standard of progress." This remained his firm conviction, and it was to prove momentous to the course of the German revolution. In the emperorless Federation, Frederick William wished ever to play the second role, to act as imperial captain of the host and arch-chancellor. The ideas that had once animated the Great King seemed idle treason to the epigone. Many a time did he exclaim: "I wish to hold Austria's stirrup." The king was better pleased with the pacific and indefinite thoughts of the prince consort, though he could not suppress a tart observation anent sitting at board far away from Germany. He protested earnestly against two only of the proposals. Frederick William likewise desired German freedom, "but never in the sense of the liberals. . . . The vulgar liberals à la Hansemann & Co. can practise but one art, namely, the art of making the people stupid and refractory. Herein, as in so much else, liberalism shows that it had learned from the Jesuits and has far outstripped them at their own game. Liberalism, now filling Germany with unsavoury odours, is a generic religion, a transitional religion, which is being superimposed upon Christianity —just as the cap of the galley-slave was set upon Louis XVI's head in order to annul his anointing. Liberalism is a superstition of the basest sort, for it preaches as the essence of its faith the worship of the will of the people, thus constituting an idolatry a hundredfold more vile than that of Baal or Astarte, for in the worship of these the folk was misled by false miracles and jugglery. Worship of the people is

glaringly refuted by the history of mankind for the last six thousand years ! ! ! " In the second place, the king declared it impossible that Germany's princes and princelets should ever relinquish a tittle of their sovereign rights " The rulers will do nothing of the sort. On behalf of the Federation some modification of sovereign rights has been essential, but on behalf of Prussia they will be even more unwilling to contemplate anything of the kind than on behalf of Austria." [1] He thus believed that his plans for federal reform, though they presupposed a notable restriction of territorial authority, would be realised quite spontaneously by the free and unanimous assent of the thirty-eight sovereign princes !

The tenour of Canitz' reply was identical. He scoffed at " the suggestion which counsels as the best means for the strengthening of the Germanic Federation the lopping off of its mightiest limb ; the cure, as with so many allopathic mixtures, is far worse than the ailment it sets out to alleviate." Then he gave Bunsen, the go-between, " a straight German tip," writing : " Among all living rulers not one is less in need of foreign purveyors of ideas than the king our most gracious master." [2] He did not question the justification for the stimulating ideas of nationality and of a representative constitution which had been raised by the summoning of the united diet ; unfortunately these ideas had been made use of by Germany's internal enemies and converted into a slogan of revolution ; his king, therefore, hoped that " the German princes will come to recognise in their cohesion, and in their adhesion to the powerful prop afforded by the Federation, not a danger but rather a weapon for the defence of their own rights." [3]

Thus vacillating was the attitude of the Prussian court in face of the growing nationalist movement. Doubtless the king and his entourage were full of good will ; but they were wholly incapable of fathoming the power of liberal ideas, and were wanting in lofty ambition, the lack of which is always the precursor of political disaster. With the free assent of Austria and of all the other sovereign states the king hoped (as Radowitz expressed it) " to enable the cherished institution of the Germanic Federation, the mainstay of the future, to

[1] King Frederick William to Bunsen, November 11, 1847.
[2] Canitz to Bunsen, November 9, 1847.
[3] Canitz to Radowittz, August 16, 1847.

fulfil its historic mission."[1] Indefatigably did Frederick William ponder these projects; it was, however, in the nature of things that his thoughts upon the subject should take far longer to mature than his constitutional plans. Canitz had for years been in communication with Metternich concerning federal policy, sometimes by means of a personal exchange of letters, sometimes through the interviews granted to Baron von Werner, whose services were now as necessary to the Austrian chancellery "as daily bread. . . . He is," wrote his old patron, "at one and the same time a loyal subject and an intellectual. He understands me, and will, therefore, understand you as well. To-day more than ever is it necessary that those should understand one another who still possess a head and limbs, and who are not numbered among the anencephalics and paralytics."[2] As a matter of fact, Werner was no more than a useful bureaucrat of the ordinary type, without ideas and without energy. Even an abler man would have found it impossible to bridge the chasm which separated the two states. Still assailed with tremors over the Leipzig unrest, Metternich demanded the inauguration of strict measures against the new sects. Canitz, however, resolutely upheld the traditions of the monarchy, traditions which had stood the test of time. "Religious freedom, as it exists in Prussia, is a product of our history from which the six-and-forty years of Frederick II's reign would have to be erased were we to interpret your idea as Emperor Joseph II might have interpreted it—with perfect justification from his point of view."[3]

Just as little was it possible to come to an agreement concerning the press law. Metternich demanded as a cure for Germany's deep-rooted ailments the relentless enforcement of the Carlsbad decrees, which had already proved impracticable. Canitz, ironically responding to Metternich's favourite simile, wrote: "An invalid cannot be restored to health simply by being reminded of prescriptions the following of which might have safeguarded him from the fever now assailing him."[4] Canitz demanded freedom of the press [from censorship] combined with extensive powers of suppression after publication, for the king and Savigny had at length learned, through the lamentable experiences with the supreme board of censorship, how little

[1] Radowitz' Report, January 5, 1847.
[2] Metternich to Canitz, August 25, 1845.
[3] Canitz to Metternich, August 29, 1845; February 14, 1846.
[4] Canitz to Metternich, November 1, 1845.

was to be achieved by that method.[1] Metternich contested the point in his liveliest manner: "I know of no statesman either in England or in France who does not regard freedom of the press as an unmitigated misfortune, for, from its very nature, such freedom must inevitably degenerate into licence. It is not possible that any measures appertaining to the juste milieu between life and death, appertaining that is to say to the domain of disease, can provide the substance of laws to regulate normal life." To which the Prussian replied: "Our proposal is a juste milieu between life and death, but only in so far as such things appertain to human life in this imperfect world. It would constitute too harsh a judgment on our fatherland were one to maintain that the power of the press could exercise nothing but a bad influence upon Germany, when we have to admit that even the strictures of a vigorous censorship have not succeeded in crippling it."[2] The old Austrian chancellor, whose ideas had by now become absolutely stereotyped, could not understand the insistence of the Prussian. In the spring of 1847, after a further exchange of letters, he despatched his friend Councillor Werner to Berlin in order to see whether the arts of Austrian cajolery might not sweep away Prussia's plans for federal reform and simultaneously settle the Cracow dispute.[3]

While Werner was spending his days at the Prussian court, Canitz had the circular despatch of April 4, 1847, sent to all the German governments. Herein was at length disclosed the long-awaited draft for a federal press law. Since Canitz desired to see the censorship which had been decreed by the Federation abolished in Prussia, and yet recognised that Austria, Hanover, and Electoral Hesse would never willingly concur in such a reform, he phrased § 1 of his draft in tentative terms: "Each German federal state shall, at discretion, abolish the censorship and introduce freedom of the press." Thereupon followed an enumeration of the "guarantees" which the states that had determined upon introducing freedom of the press were to give their federal colleagues: a strict system of concessions for printers of books and publishers of newspapers; severe penalties for transgressions of the press law; and, finally, the establishment of a federal syndicate of persons

[1] Savigny to Thile, March 28, 1845.
[2] Metternich to Canitz, April 16; Reply, April 26, 1846.
[3] See above, p. 353.

well versed in the law which would be competent to prohibit such writings as it should deem to be a common danger to Germany as a whole. However petty these restrictions might appear, the abolition of the censorship, should it take place, could not fail to produce decisive results, for it was obvious that, with the exception of Austria, all the other states would soon be constrained to follow Prussia's good example. At the Bundestag, Saxony, Baden, Weimar, and even the conservative Darmstadt, proved to be favourably inclined. Würtemberg in especial accepted the Prussian proposal with eagerness. King William, as he confided to Count Dönhoff, had at last allowed himself to be persuaded by the passionate complaints of his diet, and he agreed that the censorship was impossible. A veteran campaigner, he beat a dignified retreat, and never allowed his equanimity to be ruffled by the fact that shortly before he had hurled all his forces against the freedom of the press.[1] He now demanded the abolition of the censorship and the use throughout Germany of extensive powers to suppress printed matter after publication.

But once more all was to be wrecked by the ill-will of the Hofburg. It was pitiable to witness how the mind of the aging chancellor was becoming more and more confused. Metternich chose these very days, days during which he was vitally concerned about the Italian unrest, days when the French were describing the empire as "an Italian power," to assure Count Arnim positively and not without a certain tetchiness: "Austria is a realm which gathers beneath its sway peoples of different nationalities, but as a realm it has only one nationality. Austria is German, German by her history, German in her territorial core, and German by her civilisation."[2] Yet at the same time he seemed to imagine that this German power was most usefully fulfilling its obligations to Germany by doing absolutely nothing! His faithful ally, Münch, postponed the discussion of the Prussian proposals from month to month; and when at last in September they did come up for discussion he suggested, as usual, that the envoys should await further instructions.[3] Many more months had now to slip away, and the individual opinions that drifted in one by one showed clearly enough that no unanimity was likely to be

[1] Dönhoff's Report, August 15, 1847.
[2] Count Arnim's Report, July 20, 1847.
[3] Dönhoff's Report, July 23 and September 9, 1847.

achieved. Bavaria declared (January, 1848) that a federal law seemed superfluous, seeing that the Bavarian constitution sufficed to ensure freedom for the Bavarian press. Thus was this great national undertaking to perish also in the general shipwreck of the Federation.

No less fruitless were the joint labours of Würtemberg and Prussia to bring about another necessary reform. King William had discovered, during the famine of the previous winter, how uneasy the proud Hofburg felt at the prospect of publicity. Transport on the Danube had suddenly been prohibited in the case of Austrian grain destined for Würtemberg, and it was not until Würtemberg threatened to make the matter public that the prohibition had been withdrawn for the nonce. Enlightened by this experience, the wily Swabian king determined to recommend the publication of the more important protocols of the Bundestag (Frankfort, March 26, 1847). Again did Münch endeavour to hold back the deliberations. Dönhoff, however, brought forward in September a committee's report which went far beyond the Würtemberger's modest proposition. The Prussian pointed out that even the Reichstag of Ratisbon had published the reports of its sittings, and he bluntly demanded a return to the old customs as they had existed prior to the year 1824; that is to say, publicity as a rule, a rule liable to occasional exceptions. The committee was unanimous—thus mightily did the current of public opinion find its way into the Bundestag. Austria alone dissented. Münch, though a member of the committee, had not attended one of its sittings. Now he declared in the name of his court: "Secrecy is undoubtedly to be preferred; at most it might be conceded that the protocols, after careful editing, could be published at the end of each session, not in the newspapers but in a special collection." Again did the envoys agree to await instructions, and the proposal remained on the table—until the collapse of the Federation. The kings of Prussia and of Würtemberg, however, had palpable experience of the curse of secrecy in federal affairs; of all their honest endeavours to secure reforms, only the vaguest rumours filtered down to the nation.[1]

Outside the Bundestag, the Berlin court was no less assiduous in trying to achieve reforms that should affect the whole of Germany. On its initiative there assembled at

[1] Dönhoff's Report, September 13, 1847.

Dresden towards the close of the year 1847 a German postal conference, which unfortunately achieved little of importance because particularist jealousy was not to be persuaded. It was agreed to retain the separate postal treaties entered into, in the early forties, by Prussia, Bavaria, Saxony, Baden, and Taxis. Another conference, summoned at the same time under Prussian auspices, was productive of better results. The aim of this gathering was to secure an agreement concerning the regulations relating to exchange. The idea had already been promulgated by Würtemberg ten years earlier at the customs conference, but had at that time been rejected as quite impracticable. It was no longer possible to ignore the needs of commerce, which had grown so mightily during the decade; and, since this particular unification of law did not in any way invade the shrine of sovereignty, the Prussian government ventured to invite, not only the members of the customs union, but, in addition, all the other federal states. Leipzig was the inevitable meeting-place; here, in the huge fair town, the inconveniences of the extant legal disintegration could be studied at the very source; here had arisen in recent times a school of doughty lawyers who had specialised in the doctrine of exchange, among whom may be mentioned Einert and Treitschke. These men had freed themselves from the trammels of Roman law, and had endeavoured to adapt their science to the exigencies of modern trade. The kernel of the discussions was furnished by a Prussian draft towards the composition of which Savigny had collaborated. Privy Councillor Bischoff, a Harzer, who was to vindicate once again the legal fame of the land which had given birth to the great lawyer Eicke von Repgow, reputed author of the Sachsenspiegel, championed the draft with triumphant perspicacity and winning dexterity. The able old President Einert, Saxony's plenipotentiary, gave cordial assistance, although the conference did not agree with the fundamental idea of his theory. As early as December 9th, after the deliberations had lasted fifty days, the German regulations for exchange were brought to completion. The work was excellently finished and could hardly have reached such perfection under parliamentary ægis. The law was short and to the point, as Savigny in his youthful writings had demanded that all laws should be. Only the leading propositions were enumerated, and never did the document stray off into discursive casuistry. It was a juristic work of art. By

a malicious trick of destiny, however, this law, the only one valid for the whole of Germany drafted during the dominion of the Bundestag, was never to be promulgated by that body. The unrest of the following months prevented the discharge of this function, and it was not until the autumn of 1848, and through the newly established German national authority, that the law was finally enacted. It was natural for the uninitiated to ascribe the gift to the revolution. The Bundestag once again forfeited its reward.

In Frederick William's eyes all this was but the prelude to a comprehensive scheme for federal reform which he communicated through General Radowitz to the Viennese court at the end of November, 1847. Radowitz was his most intimate adviser in these German affairs, for, while some of the ministers were unable to outsoar their jejune business scruples, others could not overcome their timidities, and General Gerlach combated any manifestation of "germanomania." In a great memorial, under date November 20th, Radowitz voiced the ideas of his royal master. The memorial sharply condemned the hitherto extant federal system, and roundly declared: "Concerning the question as to what the Federation has done, during the thirty-two years of its existence, and during an unparalleled period of peace, towards the strengthening and development of Germany, no answer is possible. The mighty force of the present, nationality, has proved to be the most dangerous weapon in the hands of the foes of public order." Prussia therefore demanded the strengthening of federal authority in three directions. First of all it was necessary to achieve the military security of the Federation by periodic inspections, joint manœuvres, agreement concerning army regulations, ordnance, etc.—but without destroying the military organisation already in force. In the second place, there must come into existence assured legal protection, that is to say, a federal court to deal with constitutionalist disputes, uniformity of criminal law, of commercial law, and citizenship, with absolutely free transferability of domicile. Last of all were requisite the promotion of material interests by the introduction of a uniform system of coinage, of weights and measures, of postal and railway services, of federal consulates and, finally, "the extension of the customs union to cover the whole Federation."

Like all Radowitz' literary work, the memorial was high-minded, thoughtful, and admirable in point of form; but it

was affected with the dreamy obscurity from which the whole nation (except for a few fortunate individuals) still suffered. It gave expression to the preposterous hope that a league of sovereign states to which three nongerman powers belonged would prove competent to exercise the functions of a national state authority. Was it possible that the king, who had hitherto steadfastly refused to permit the Hofburg any kind of interference with his customs policy, should now seriously propose to destroy his father's greatest work, and to fulfil Metternich's long-standing wish by placing this customs union under the control of the Bundestag? Could he intend to do such a thing at the very moment when the Hofburg was about to throw down the customs barriers between Hungary and the German-Bohemian crown lands, thus giving an unmistakable indication that Austria herself had no desire to join the customs union? As in a glass darkly, Frederick William perceived that he was becoming entangled in contradictions. In Radowitz' memorial, therefore, he allowed it to be explained that in the first instance he was seeking an understanding with the court of Vienna. Should this be achieved, a more precise agreement concerning the proposed reforms would be work for a congress of princes or for the Bundestag, under Austria's leadership. If he were to fail in Vienna, he would, doubtless with a heavy heart, apply single-handed to the Bundestag. Were even this attempt to fail, Prussia would appeal to "the spirit of the nation," would enlighten public opinion anent Prussia's designs on behalf of Germany, and, after negotiation with federal states sharing Prussia's views, would enter with these into separate agreements modelled upon the customs union treaties. In the long run, these agreements could not fail to prove advantageous to the entire fatherland. The king seemed to have realised at length that the primary aim of a conservative policy must be an attempt to gratify the national yearning for unity. He appeared to be drawing near towards accepting the bold ideas to which at this juncture Mathy was giving utterance in Heppenheim. But this was mere semblance. Frederick William neither knew nor wished to know the radical intensity of the great struggles in German politics. All he desired was to attain his own ends peacefully and while avoiding any breach with Austria. He failed to realise that the customs union conflicted as diametrically with the basic particularist ideas of the federal act as in old days the

Schmalkaldian League had conflicted with the essential nature of the Holy Roman Empire. He failed to realise that, since these things were so, it would be quite impossible for the Hofburg to look on indifferently whilst a system of Prusso-German separate treaties came into existence. The battle of Pharsalia which King Frederick had long ago prophesied for the Germans had inevitably to be fought, but no one was less inclined to believe in this necessity than the Great King's successor, Frederick William IV.

Radowitz made his way to Vienna bearing the proposals outlined above, and was received at the Austrian capital with the customary non-committal courtesy. Negotiations were broken off at a very early stage, for the Hofburg's attention was monopolised by the troubles in Italy. Frederick William, a declared enemy of Frederician policy, detested the Great King's "heathenish" principle that an opponent's embarrassments must be seized as an opportunity for a decisive stroke. In his view, moreover, Austria was not an opponent, but a loyal if somewhat heavy-footed friend. To take advantage of Metternich's distressing situation would have seemed to him an unchristian act. Moreover, he had commissioned Radowitz to come to an understanding with the chancellor for joint action between Prussia and Austria in opposition to Swiss radicalism. To both the powers, this unlucky idea of intervention seemed of such prime importance that the wider interests of German policy receded into the background. With a view to securing a settlement upon the Swiss question, the general had to return to Berlin in December and then to undertake a journey to Paris. While this was in progress, time was passing, time that would have been of inestimable value for the work of German federal reform. Not until February, 1848, did the king take up once more his federal plans. On March 1st Radowitz was instructed to repair yet another time to Vienna, to propose there the immediate summoning of a congress of the German sovereigns, who were to discuss federal reform and in addition to consider the imminent peril of war. On March 10th, Metternich, swayed by tidings of the revolution in Paris, approved the Prussian proposal. Within a few days, however, the old system crumbled to ruin alike in Vienna and in Berlin. The last chance of bringing about a peaceful federal reform had been missed. The negotiations of this winter had been kept a profound secret, and to the world, therefore, the

congress of sovereigns, though it had been mooted long before the revolution, seemed a concession enforced by the revolution. Just as Frederick William III had found it impossible to ward off Jena by the laudable plans he had cherished during the opening years of his reign, so was his son forced to learn that in the arduous daily work of politics good intentions count for nothing. When the epoch of unrest came the king was burdened with an evil reputation which was no more than half-deserved.

CHAPTER X.

PRECURSORS OF THE EUROPEAN REVOLUTION.

§ I. DISINTEGRATION OF THE ALLIANCES. AUSTRIA AND ITALY.

When a decayed political authority is ripe for destruction, by the compulsion of a just fate it is invariably constrained to make manifest once again to all the world and upon the very margin of the tomb the crimes for which it is responsible. Intensely had Europe suffered from the arbitrary excesses of the dynasts after the sales of territory effected during the Napoleonic epoch and at the Vienna congress. So terrible, indeed, had been the sufferings that, despite the ancient monarchical traditions of Europe, there had been a certain justification for the growth of a republican party. Now, immediately before the fall of the old system, a renewed demonstration was to be given of the depths of abasement to which dynastic statecraft could descend, and this nauseating spectacle was to be the work of the two ruling houses which had proclaimed themselves exceptionally liberal and democratic, the houses of Coburg and Orleans. Cherishing the happy illusion that the progressive culture of the understanding carries with it for mankind all the other elements of progress, those of the new era plumed themselves upon moral superiority to all who had lived in earlier centuries. Writing of the notorious and cynical exchange of letters between Ferdinand the Catholic and Henry VII of England anent the marriage of their children, historians would express astonishment, suggesting that such cozenage on the part of sovereign princes was possible only to the contemporaries of Machiavelli. But they were now to learn that civilisation, whilst effecting a refinement of manners, works no change in the sinfulness of human nature. They were forced to admit that, in comparison with the constitutionalist rulers who held their courts in Paris, London, and Madrid, the fifteenth century autocrats seem nothing more than boys playing with tops.

Vanished were the days when the world had been edified by the glorious quadruple alliance of the free peoples of the west. Unhappy Spain was disintegrated by civil war; and on all hands people were beginning to feel that arbitrary interference with monarchical succession is a crime, destroying as it does the very foundations of law and justice. The courts were busied with the question, how a settled dynasty could be restored to this distracted land. To Metternich occurred the obvious idea that a marriage between young Queen Isabella and Count Montemolin, son of Don Carlos, would reconcile the two hostile Bourbon lines, and that this expedient would restore a stable legitimate monarchy. The veteran chancellor fostered the notion tenderly, referring to it as "mon idée,"[1] King Frederick William, an enthusiastic legitimist, gave it his most cordial support. Theoretically, the plan was no less excellent than the proposal to settle the Germano-Danish dispute by founding an Augustenburg monarchy, but the one was no less impracticable than the other. The two parties to the suggested marriage were filled with mutual hatred. It was impossible that Don Carlos, though he had just abdicated in favour of his son, should ever formally recognise his niece's right of succession.

It was necessary, therefore, to look elsewhere for a bridegroom. Now in the Coburg view every vacant throne on earth belonged by right to the members of the great matrimonial agency in Brussels, and King Leopold had long held in readiness his nephew Prince Leopold of Coburg-Kohary, regarding the young man as predestined to ascend the Spanish throne. As early as 1841, when Queen Isabella was barely eleven years old, to the Prussian guests at the court of London, Leopold was pointed out as the future king of Spain.[2] These proposals did not appear altogether hopeless. After so many fortunate marriages, the house of Coburg was on terms of close association with the French court no less than with the English, so that there was good reason to expect the approval of Louis Philippe. The king of the Belgians, who had necessarily to maintain friendly relations with the two western powers, would not go forward with the scheme without the bourgeois king's consent. At the Tuileries, however, difficulties were soon raised. Portugal was already ruled by a scion of the house of Coburg, and Portugal was suffering severely from the exactions of British

[1] Canitz' Report, April 12, 1845. [2] See vol. VI, p. 453.

commercial policy. Involuntarily the thought suggested itself that to establish a Coburg monarchy in Madrid would make English influence predominant throughout the peninsula.

Despite their use of liberal phraseology, the courts of the western powers were still completely enthralled by the notions of the old cabinet policy. Long before, in the war of the Spanish succession, streams of blood had flowed fruitlessly in Europe because the courts had believed that under Bourbon kings Spain would perforce become a French province, an assumption which time was to disprove. Louis Philippe, in like manner, though he knew Spain well, was unable to make due allowance for the terrible hatred of foreigners which prevails in that land, a sentiment which makes it impossible in the long run for Spain to be subjected to foreign rule. Just as little as the English court did the bourgeois monarch concern himself about the sentiments of the people whose destiny was at stake. All that influenced him was the consideration that a Coburg ruler in Madrid might place difficulties in the way of French diplomacy. On the other hand, he could not but be attracted by the thought that a great Bourbon family alliance might bring glory and brilliance to his usurped crown. He solemnly appealed to the peace of Utrecht, in virtue of which none but a descendant of Philip V might ascend the throne of Spain; and he demanded Isabella's hand for a Bourbon of the Spanish or the Neapolitan royal house. Maria Louisa Ferdinanda, Isabella's sister, would, he hoped, marry his youngest son, the duke of Montpensier. The English court, however, entered a strong protest, for by the treaty of Utrecht all the Bourbons who were not of the stock of Philip V, and in especial all members of the house of Orleans, had renounced hereditary claims to the Spanish crown. How preposterous a display of political hypocrisy! The treaty of Urecht had been torn up long ago, and by whom? By the two western powers! Through their quadruple alliance they had annulled the salic law based upon the treaty of Utrecht, the salic law which recognised the direct male issue of Philip V as alone entitled to the Spanish succession. Now these same western powers vied with one another in appealing to the treaty they had destroyed. Beyond question, Metternich had good reason for making mock of the utter mendacity of these model constitutionalist courts.

Such was the posture of affairs when Queen Victoria,

after her German tour (1845), paid another visit to the hospitable château of Eu. It was her womanly desire to be on good terms with everyone, and she was treated with paternal kindliness by the bourgeois king. The result was that the queen and the prince consort (as Prince Albert admitted in profound secrecy to his brother Duke Ernest) were cajoled into giving the ill-considered promise that they would use all their influence to bring about a marriage between Isabella and one of the Bourbons.[1] In return Louis Philippe promised that the marriage of his son the duke of Montpensier should be postponed for a time, until Queen Isabella should have issue. The pledge was manifestly ridiculous, and could serve only to show once again how little these liberal courts understood popular sentiment. Anyone could foresee that the Spaniards, should their queen remain childless, would unanimously and vociferously demand the marriage of the younger sister. Both parties to these remarkable undertakings were dishonest. Prince Albert hoped that by one means or another the Bourbon marriage might be frustrated, and he continued to intrigue on behalf of his cousin. In the spring of 1846 Leopold, the Coburg suitor, paid a chance visit to the London court, and subsequently, accompanied by his father, paid another chance visit to the Coburg relatives in Lisbon. At the same time Duke Ernest of Coburg, likewise quite accidentally, set out for Spain. The bourgeois king was by no means of a trusting disposition. He could hardly be expected to give serious credence to the suggestion that all these Coburg excursions were purely fortuitous, and he therefore considered himself no longer bound by his pledges.

The plans for a Bourbon marriage were, however, gravely compromised by the intestine disputes of Spain. After the overthrow of the Carlists, the country had been divided into the two hostile camps of the progressists and the moderados. Espartero, the progressist leader, made no secret of his anglophil views. He had disbanded the guards, this step being extolled by Lord Lieutenant Schön to his friend Boyen as a shining example of liberal stalwartness ; and he had inflicted a personal humiliation upon Maria Christina, the queen mother, depriving

[1] Duke Ernest of Coburg was the first to reveal these facts with German frankness (Aus meinem Leben, vol. I, pp. 151 et. seq.). It will readily be understood that he does not disclose the whole truth, but he admits a great deal more than had been admitted by Stockmar, Bulwer, Martin, and other Anglo-Coburg reporters, and he says quite enough to enable unprejudiced Germans to form a sound opinion.

her of the regency, and sending her for a time to France. When Maria Christina returned from exile she was naturally hostile to the progressists, and was inclined, though not unconditionally, to favour the francophil party, that of General Narvaes and the moderados. Of the three Bourbon princes who could alone aspire to Isabella's hand, one, a Neapolitan brother of the queen mother, was soon rejected as impossible. There thus remained available only two Spanish infantes. The elder of these, Duke Francis of Cadiz, bigoted and narrow-minded, was a fanatical moderado. His younger brother, Duke Henry of Seville, was deeply involved in progressist intrigues, and owing to his radical insolence had become completely estranged from both the queens. Naturally, Francis was the suitor favoured by the bourgeois king, seeing that Francis was a moderado and a francophil.[1]

A fierce faction fight now ensued at the court of Madrid. Bresson and Bulwer, envoys from France and England respectively, both hot-headed and both equally quarrelsome, endeavoured to thwart one another by every conceivable trick. Now, all of a sudden, a third thread was interwoven into this complicated diplomatic tangle—by Lord Palmerston, who had just entered the British cabinet. Had Palmerston acted on cool calculation, he would have supported the Coburg candidate, whose success might well have proved advantageous to England. As far as physical merits were concerned, the Coburger, young and vigorous, was greatly superior to the Spanish infantes' pitiable specimens of humanity. In an access of maternal tenderness, therefore, Maria Christina determined to stifle her French inclinations, and wrote to the duke of Coburg making a formal offer to wed her daughter to his nephew. Had the young duke now taken resolute action as match-maker he could not have failed to secure the prize for his relative. Palmerston, however, had since the disputes in the east cherished an inextinguishable hatred for Louis Philippe and Guizot. He cared not a jot for the house of Coburg, and indeed had a positive dislike for the prince consort, whose influence at court threatened at times to restrict the omnipotence of the cabinet. Moreover, the Coburg candidate was suspect to Palmerston as being close kin to Louis Philippe.

[1] Duke Ernest's narrative is in these respects perfectly confirmed by an obviously trustworthy report received by the Prussian foreign office on November 25, 1846, from one of its agents in Madrid.

The British minister wished to oppose France at any cost. It was his habit to take short views, and he expressed himself decisively in favour of Duke Henry of Seville, since Henry was at the moment supported by the anglophil progressist party. In this manner England's diplomacy was paralysed, for the royal house and the foreign office were pursuing different aims, and the event was speedily to show how little the British crown could effect unaided. The Coburgs could not venture to oppose Palmerston and Louis Philippe at one and the same time. After prolonged family councils, Duke Ernest was empowered to reply to the queen mother saying that the Coburg marriage seemed inadvisable in view of French hostility to the scheme. This put an end to the chances of Prince Leopold, who might have been able to lead a respectable family life at the court of Madrid and to restore somewhat the greatly lowered prestige of the Spanish monarchy.

For the first time since the Coburg family had made the hymeneal cult the basis of its European policy did it prove necessary to abandon a finely woven matrimonial plan. The decisive factor in the failure was that King Leopold, the most successful matrimonial agent in the family, was unable, since he was now working in opposition to France, to make a full use of his unerring arts of compromise. But almost at the same moment Palmerston suffered a defeat. With brutal lack of consideration he had hoped to force upon the young Isabella a spouse of his own choosing; but the two queens declared as with one voice that nothing would induce them to countenance the suit of the rebel Henry of Seville. There remained only the most preposterous of the three suitors, Louis Philippe's candidate, Francis of Cadiz, and now was revealed the uncleanest secret in all these unclean negotiations. "Despicable Francis," as Isabella termed him, could have no hope of issue. Were it merely on account of the shrill tones of his falsetto voice, he was intolerable to the young queen. But for this very reason he was the chosen of Louis Philippe. Isabella's marriage must remain childless, so that the succession might devolve upon her sister Louisa and the issue of Montpensier. To marry this glowing girl, full of life and vigour, daughter of a Maria Christina, to a man who was no man at all—such was the piece of devilry upon which the honourable bourgeois king and his minister had determined.

They gained their end. In October, 1846, Isabella was

wedded to the infante Francis who, for the enhancement of the farce, received the title of king. On the self-same day the infanta Louisa was married to the duke of Montpensier, but this ceremony was arranged for a somewhat later hour, so that the virtuous Guizot could innocently declare that the two marriages had not taken place simultaneously. The upshot was what anyone with a knowledge of human nature must have foreseen. Within a few weeks the young queen drove her wretched spouse out of the palace, and made amends for his absence by bestowing her favours upon various lovers. Children were duly forthcoming, and since these offshoots derived their right to the throne solely through the mother, the question of their paternity was of trifling importance. By the kindly offices of Spain's French patrons this crown, which after such abundance of disgrace was chiefly in need of moral regeneration, became hopelessly besmirched, so that the Madrid palace was universally contemned as the scene of unworthy excesses. The francophil Francis, styled king, was utterly without political influence, whilst Isabella vacillated unceasingly between the two contending parties. On the other hand, Montpensier and his sons, being foreigners, could not win prestige. The immediate political aim of the two marriages, brought about by such despicable means, remained unfulfilled; and constitutionalist France cared little for the futile splendours of the great Bourbon family alliance.

The Comedy of Spanish Errors had a notable repercussion upon European policy. The vaunted entente cordiale, which had still been held together, though with difficulty, after the troubles in the east, was suddenly thrown quite out of gear. Henceforward the two western powers were continually and publicly at odds. Louis Philippe identified himself even more closely than before with the reactionary policy of the Hofburg. Palmerston, now for the first time fully revealed as Lord Firebrand, did his utmost to incite opposition to the conservative powers in every quarter of the world. The most sacred political principle of the British, the principle that England alone is entitled to deceive other powers, had been too grossly infringed by the cunning gamesters of Paris; and, with the characteristic indignation of the tricked trickster, Palmerston turned the forces of the press loose against the faithless French. Though at bottom there was little to choose between the conduct of the respective courts towards their Spanish protégé, it must

be admitted that the behaviour of France had been even more sordid than that of England. But, since the court of the Tuileries had carried off the prize, ill-informed persons naturally supposed that France was the only offender; and even in France the savage onslaughts of the English newspapers produced so powerful an impression that the reputation of the July monarchy, which had long ere this been considerably damaged, was now utterly undermined. The self-praise voiced in Guizot's newspapers, which wrote, "France is everywhere loved and dreaded," had a mocking ring even in French ears.

In his blind wrath, Palmerston hit upon the almost incredible expedient of demanding that the eastern powers should rally to the defence of the treaty of Utrecht, a treaty which had been torn up by his own criminal act. They were to make a joint declaration with England that no member of the house of Montpensier could ever wear the Spanish crown, and they were to assert that in accordance with the salic law the inheritance of that crown was to pass henceforward to the direct male heirs of the new pseudo-king![1] First of all to suspend the salic law amid all the horrors of civil war, and subsequently to reinforce it on behalf of the unentitled descendants of the female line—this was what was termed "right" in pious England! The reception of the remarkable invitation was not untinged with irony on the part of the eastern courts. They had remained all too faithful to the terms of the peace of Utrecht, and had not yet recognised Isabella's right to the succession. When Palmerston now maintained that the Spanish double marriage was the most impudent outcome of French land-hunger since the days of the first Napoleon, the exaggeration could serve only to raise a smile. The duke of Montpensier was the youngest of five brothers, and more than one of the four elders already possessed sons, so that the chance that the crowns of France and Spain would ever be united on the head of a single ruler seemed incalculably remote.

The czar, who had always regarded the Spanish disorders as of trifling importance, arrogantly opined that the dispute about the marriages did not afford any reason for granting recognition to Isabella, the illegitimist queen. Nesselrode was not slow to realise that the remarkable overtures made by the English court were solely the outcome of Palmerston's temporary

[1] Bunsen's Report, October 26, 1846.

irritability.[1] Metternich's attitude was, if possible, even colder. As Canitz soon perceived, the chancellor's aim, while playing the lion in Cracow, was to play the lamb in Spain, so that the bourgeois king might be bound more closely to the Austrian cause, and so that Austria might be enabled to act in concert with France both in Italy and in Switzerland. Metternich consequently preserved, as he himself boasted, an attitude of intelligent expectation.[2]

The court of Berlin showed itself somewhat more inclined to meet England's advances. Bunsen was careful to report the assurances he received from all the English ministers, to the effect that France, now grown powerful in Spain, would prove arrogant on the Po and on the Rhine.[3] In Berlin at this juncture the current was in favour of the visionary English alliance. In the instructions he issued, Canitz continually recurred to proposals for the renewal of the old quadruple alliance.[4] The king declared in vigorous terms: "Montpensier's children will be Orleans and Montpensiers; they will not be Spanish infantes. LEGALLY, therefore, they can never succeed to the throne of Spain." By Frederick William's orders, Leopold Ranke compiled an historical opinion, which fully confirmed this well-grounded view of the legal position.[5] In the end, however, Canitz' sober counsels prevailed. Canitz had said: "We will not approve the behaviour of France, but neither will we allow ourselves to be taken in tow by Palmerston in a matter wherein England's conduct has been by no means unexceptionable.[6] To the proud courts of the east, which had never failed to observe decency in political relations, the unsavouriness of the Spanish affairs could not fail to be nauseating. Canitz wrote contemptuously: "A peculiar creation of our own day is this granting of the courtesy title of king to the queen of Spain's stud-horse, an inefficient stallion if all tales be true."[7]

Palmerston, being thus cold-shouldered by the eastern powers, now made up his mind, as he explained to the ever

[1] Rochow's Reports, September 22 and December 14, 1846.

[2] Canitz to Rochow, December 6, 1846.

[3] Bunsen's Report, September 11, 1846.

[4] Canitz to Rochow, December 6; Canitz to Heinrich von Arnim in Paris, December 13, 1846.

[5] King Frederick William, Marginal Note for Thile, September 25; Leopold Ranke, Memorial concerning the Peace of Utrecht, November, 1846.

[6] Canitz to Rochow, October 21, 1846.

Canitz to Rochow, October 31, 1846.

credulous Bunsen, to conduct the diplomatic war against France upon a broader basis, that of civil and religious liberty, which Canning had inscribed upon his banner twenty years earlier.[1] His wrath against Guizot was plainly shown in the Cracow dispute, for in this matter he frustrated any attempt at a joint protest on the part of the western powers. It was shown in Pera and in Athens, for in both these cities strife between the British and the French envoys was unceasing. It was shown most plainly of all in Portugal, where Palmerston went so far as to support with arms a fresh rising against good Queen Maria, and where he ultimately established more firmly than ever the tyrannical commercial supremacy of England.

In Central Europe, no less, there were places enough in which Lord Firebrand could lay the mines of revolution. The very power which in the society of states had hitherto maintained an unnatural preponderance, now showed itself to be the weakest of them all. Within the realms of the other great powers, trouble was caused merely by the struggles of factions, but in Austria the very existence of the community seemed at stake. Even more plainly than in the case of the united state of Denmark was there now demonstrated, in the case of the medley of peoples that made up the Danubian realm, the old truth that a living national sentiment affords the securest foundation for political liberty. But directly the ancient absolutism became weakened, and as soon as constitutionalist ideas began to spread, the awakening of contrifugal forces was inevitable in a community whereof the Lombards were wont to say: "It is not a state, but merely a family." Among the nationalities which combined to form the Austrian empire, not one, even if all the Slavic tribes were reckoned as a single stock, comprised a majority. Among them all, moreover, two groups only were well-affected towards Austria, the Germans, who numbered barely a fourth of the total population, and the petty people of the Ruthenians in Galicia. Whilst the subteutonic stocks of the Magyars, the Slavs, and the Wallachians, peoples whose civilisation was wholly derived from the Germans, awakening now to a youthful self-conceit, were rewarding their old teacher with the inevitable historical ingratitude, the Italian provinces had long possessed a civilisation of their own, an independent civilisation coequal

[1] Bunsen's Report, April 6, 1847.

with that of Germany, so that they remained utterly estranged from the united state of Austria, and were not even, as were the Danubian territories, connected with the other crown-lands by geographical necessity.

In Prussia, the united diet, brief as its session had been, had wonderfully strengthened the consciousness of political unity. In Austria, however, the very ideas which fortified the national state of Prussia could not but prove dangerous to the integrity of the empire. Metternich, since he would pay no heed to national sentiment, was quite unable to grasp this simple distinction. He regarded Prussia, Austria-Hungary, Sweden-Norway, and Denmark-Holstein, as states whose composition was substantially identical, and whose unity was represented solely by the respective united governments. But in 1841 Baron von Andrian, a Tyrolese nobleman of moderate liberal views who ardently desired "the evocation of an Austrian nationality," gave frank expression in his widely read book *Austria and her Future* to the view that power in Austria did not rest upon the people or public opinion, upon the nobility, or upon the bureaucracy. Least of all was it based on the emperor. It was, he said, simply the fruit of custom. Andrian's theory was absolutely correct. The senile triumvirate which held sway in the name of the imbecile emperor now gave hardly a sign of life. Archduke Louis, an easy-going man, found Metternich's lengthy and didactic homilies extremely tedious. Count Kolowrat's feeling towards the chancellor was one of hatred, hardly disguised by the restrictions of ordinary good manners. By tacit agreement among the triumvirs, their deliberations became less and less frequent, and affairs were conducted as best they might be without any real government. The effeteness of the central authority was so incurable that the viceroy of Küstenland, Count Franz Stadion, who considered that this crown-land stood in urgent need of reforms, and who could get no answer from Vienna, at length decided to introduce a new communes' ordinance upon his own responsibility. At court, during this period, there was a notable increase in the power of certain ultramontane ladies. The two Bavarian sisters, the empress dowager and Archduchess Sophia, won over to their cause the unpretentious spouse of the reigning emperor. They were able to prevent the betrothal of Archduke Stephen to Grand-Duchess Olga, their reason being that they would not tolerate a noncatholic

archduchess.[1] They were able to force Metternich to abandon the principle upon which he had previously acted and to readmit the Jesuits to Innsbruck and other towns. The upbringing of the heir to the throne, Archduke Francis Joseph, was entrusted to Count Bombelles and Count Grünne, clericalists both.

Financial stress was traditional, and grew continually worse. The secret police and the military supervision of Lombardy, Venice, and Galicia involved enormous expense, and there was no one competent to turn the lucrative crown-lands to account in the way of taxation. During the first twenty-five years after the congress of Vienna, the national debt increased by 441,000,000 gulden—though there had been no war and no productive state expenditure. Matters went from bad to worse. Salomon Rothschild, the banking firm of Sina (immeasurably enriched by dealings in grain during the famine years), in conjunction with other princes of the stock exchange, reduced the state to a shameful condition of servitude, so that the Viennese, who ever loved a jest, were fond of reiterating the new Parisian witticism: "The bourse holds the state much as the noose holds the hanged criminal." When the triumvirate, at its wit's end, decided to discontinue the purchase of private railway shares, Rothschild and some of his associates waited upon Archduke Louis to assure him that they were no longer in a position to continue payment of the instalments of the last loan. For the sheer necessaries of life, they said, they would have to sell all their national securities on the bourse. Thereupon the decision concerning railway shares was docilely rescinded.[2]

Meanwhile the Lower Austrian diet, a body entirely under the control of the nobility (for the towns had no votes), was beginning to voice ideas of its own. Fled was the time when everyone had contentedly repeated Bäuerle's saying: "There's only one imperial city; there's only one Vienna." Although the Austrians still possessed no adequate knowledge of German conditions, liberal ideas were making their way in from Germany. Even the custom house officers found a certain satisfaction when newspapers like the *Grenzbote* and volumes like those of Rotteck and Welcker were smuggled across the frontier.

[1] Such was the view generally held at the courts, and it is recorded in du Thil's Sketches.

[2] Count Arnim's Report, September 25, 1847.

Opposition sentiments prevailed in the neglected higher schools, so that the pupils were positively trained to become the revolutionary students of the epoch now approaching. It was impossible that the estates of Lower Austria should remain unaffected by these popular moods, and above all it was inevitable that they should be influenced by the loquacious metropolitan criticism of the Viennese. From 1845 onwards, discussions began to be heard in the diet, although for nearly two centuries nothing of the kind had been known. The estates demanded the foundation of an agricultural credit institute; they demanded suitable representation for the towns; they demanded, finally, the right of advising upon new laws. These facts were generally known, although the newspapers were not allowed to refer to them, and although Metternich and his officials wrapped themselves in profound silence.

Even Canitz, when still envoy in Vienna, could not refrain from saying to the chancellor: "Idleness is the root of all evil, and such has hitherto been the lot of Austria's diets; these first stirrings of a representative will are a sign of returning political health; a conservative policy will recognise and will legally regulate the rights of the estates, so that these may be a help, not a hindrance." [1] There were moments when even Metternich seemed to realise that it was impossible to rest content any longer with the ancient system of corpselike lethargy. In 1845, encouraged by Prussia's example, the government inaugurated the first Austrian industrial exhibition, but the pitiable opening address delivered by the unfortunate emperor neither contained a word about Austria nor conveyed any indication of a sense of the state. Shortly afterwards there was issued a folio volume, *Statistical Tables of the Austrian Monarchy*. It need hardly be said that no more than a few copies were printed for the use of the high officials, but when the foreign envoys proved eager for information Metternich was hardy enough to moot the question whether the publication might not be more widely circulated through the book trade.[2] The knell had sounded of the comfortable patriarchalism of yore. In Tyrol, even, now that the clericalists had constituted themselves into a definite party, lively debates were heard in the diet. Since the annexation of Cracow, Galicia had been shaken to its foundations. More threateningly

[1] Canitz' Report, May 15, 1845.
[2] Canitz' Report, May 31, 1845.

than ever resounded the ancient nationalist saying: "While the world endures, never will the Pole become the German's brother."

The national movement in Bohemia was simultaneously liberal, and was far more momentous in its consequences. The Czechs had long since awakened from their slumbers. As invariably happens with peoples regaining a consciousness of their national identity, their imaginative yearnings reached back into the primal ages of their history. Delighting in the discovery of new sources of information, some genuine and others spurious, they overflowed with enthusiasm on behalf of Queen Libussa, on behalf of the peasant victories in the Hussite wars, on behalf of King Podiebrad and all the other heroes of what had in ancient days been the most glorious of the Slavic nations. Johann Kollar, an Evangelical pastor, was their first apostle. In Schaffarik, Hanka, and Palacky, they found inspired and patriotic scholars. Havlicek was an able publicist, who ingeniously flouted the censorship by giving piteous descriptions of the miseries of Ireland whilst all his readers knew well enough that Ireland signified Bohemia. Many of the powerful condottieri families which, after the subjugation of Bohemia, had been settled in that province by Emperor Ferdinand II, now became Czech nationalists. A similar course was taken by most of the clergy, who, guided by a trustworthy flair for power, are invariably inclined to espouse the cause of the less cultured nationality. It was unfortunate for the Germans that the majority of the Jews inclined to the German party, the result being that for the Czech peasantry, who had suffered much at the hands of Jewish usurers, germanophobia was fused with and accentuated by a popular hatred of the Jews. There were Czech outposts thrusting far forward into German territory. Here the Czechs felt especially insecure, and since it is a peculiarity which the czar shares with the pope that nations venerate him the more highly the further removed from him they dwell, Bohemia was the nursery of panslavism. Enthusiasm for the crown of Wenceslaus and for the white lion was associated with hazy dreams of a splendid future for the great family of Slav nations. The Slav sun was rising; the Germans were in the noontide of their history; the Latins had reached the evening twilight of their day. While this nationalist struggle was menacing the public peace, the two hostile stocks were none the less united in their liberal aims.

The Prague diet demanded a reform of the mortgage law, the abolition of the corvée, the discontinuance of the state lottery, and even a modicum of freedom for the press. More than once the estates ventured to despatch envoys to the emperor, to voice the grievances of the province, a step which had been unknown for the past half century. The chancellor was greatly alarmed by such signs of life on the part of the old postulate diet, which had long been regarded as all but dead, and he once more began to consider the question which he had mooted thirty years earlier, whether it would not be expedient to bring into being a small committee which should constitute a harmless joint representation for the estates of all the crown-lands. Even now, however, he could not make up his mind to the venture.

All these things, however, had little significance in comparison with the storm of nationalist passion which was raging in the lands of the crown of St. Stephen, threatening to detach from the imperial state the more powerful half of the monarchy. Although after his marriage with Melanie Zichy, Metternich had become somewhat better acquainted with the Hungarian magnates, he had never considered it needful to study the peculiarities of the various nationalities under Austrian rule. His judgments concerning the subteutonic "subject races" were as foolish and arrogant as those of the Viennese writers of farce, who stigmatised every Hungarian as a booby and every Czech as a fawning rascal. Metternich was fond of telling the Prussian envoy that ingrained stupidity was the real national characteristic of the Hungarians. Nevertheless the Magyar nobles, trained in prolonged parliamentary struggles, were able with measureless national pride to dominate the other races under the crown of St. Stephen, and were able for all their arrogance to display the experienced wisdom of a ruling race. Neither the southern Slavs in the accessory territories (already dreaming of a triune kingdom in Illyria), nor yet the Slovaks in the Carpathians, nor yet the Germans, proved a match for their Magyar masters. It was only the faithful Protestant Saxons in Transylvania and the settlers in the Banate who were true to their German nationality, for the Swabians in western Hungary had ever been noted for cosmopolitan imbecility. As for the Jews, who were reckoned indispensable in this land of haphazard economic life, they already realised the trend of events, and were rallying to the Magyars.

As long before as 1843 the Reichstag had mooted the question whether an assembly of notables should not be summoned from Hungary and the German-Bohemian crown-lands for the discussion of important joint economic interests. This proposal might have led to results advantageous to the unity of the imperial state, but the triumvirate had rejected the idea with its wonted obtuseness, and since then Hungary had gone her own way. "Hungary has not yet existed, but is now beginning to exist," said Count Stefan Szechenyi, acclaimed as "the greatest of the Hungarians." With a definite political aim and with marvellous energy (resembling that displayed in earlier days by the Dutch when transforming their seamen's dialect into a literary language), the Magyars endeavoured by a wealth of writings, by schools, theatres, and newspapers, by countless enterprises on behalf of the common weal, to elevate their inchoate nationality to the level of the civilised peoples, so that the German city of Ofen [Buda] was speedily outgrown by the Magyar-Jewish town of Pesth. This was the blossoming season of Hungarian parliamentary life. Men equipped with great oratorical talents made their appearance. Besides Szechenyi there was the gifted political writer Count Eötvös, also the shrewd little country gentleman Ferencz Deak, who ere long was generally revered as the good conscience of the nation. Last of all, and overtopping all, must be mentioned the fiery demagogue Lajos Kossuth. The nationalist party had three more or less clearly conceived aims: Magyar hegemony; independence of the crown of St. Stephen; finally, the transformation of the cumbrous and timeworn system of representation by estates into a modern representative system. At the Reichstag of 1843 the nationalists, mainly through Kossuth's efforts, gained a decisive success. For hundreds of years the peoples subject to the crown of St. Stephen, employing the neutral Latin tongue as a general means of intercommunication, had lived together in tolerable peace. Latin was now done away with, to be replaced by the tongue of the dominant Magyar race. Vanished for ever were the days when the peasant would greet the nobleman with the traditional "Bonum matutinum domine!" Although German, by the indestructible right of superior culture, still maintained its status as the language of general intercourse, Germans, Slavs, and Roumanians were to make use henceforward of an official speech as yet but half developed and

to them entirely unknown. In the Reichstag the national eloquence, characterised by a great flow of language and an extensive use of metaphor, somewhat restrained heretofore by having to find expression in ponderous Latin, could now secure free vent in the peculiar rolling and blusterous violence of Magyar speech.

A crater of nationalist dissensions had been opened. The nonmagyar majority of the kingdom felt mortally affronted, and the Agram diet hastened to claim the right to conduct its deliberations in the Croat tongue. But the Magyars, drunken with victory, hurried from one demand to another. Amongst the rigidly Calvinistic lesser nobility, the old hatred for the Catholic ruling house was still active. Memories were revived of the terrible days when half Hungary had exclaimed: "Rather Turkish than Austrian." None but a portion of the magnates and of the higher clergy were still devoted to the emperor, though the Croats and the Transylvanian Saxons remained half-hearted imperialists. Unfortunately there occurred in January, 1847, the death of Archduke Joseph, the aged palatinus, who had long been suspect to the Hofburg as a potential rebel, a second Rakoczy. Settled in Hungary for half a century, Joseph, a man without conspicuous ability but benevolent in intention, had been fairly successful in keeping nationalist dissensions under control. His son Archduke Stephen was the only possible successor, an amiable and good-natured young man, an amateur of all conceivable branches of knowledge. Since the imperial house possessed so few persons of talent, many looked upon him as a great statesman, and hoped that he would some day replace the contemptible Archduke Louis as one of the triumvirs. But Stephen lacked solidity, and had an itch for popular favour. Metternich was gravely troubled when he was compelled to send a man so inexperienced to preside over this chaos of nationalist passions. In November, 1847, the afflicted emperor-king opened the Reichstag for the first time in the Magyar speech. Though the king offered a number of excellent reforms, Kossuth promptly began a fierce campaign against the beggarly privilege in virtue of which the nobles were exempt from taxation, and the majority of the house showed itself definitely hostile to the crown. In semi-barbarian lands, ideas of resistance to authority are diffused with mysterious celerity. Little as Vienna realised the fact, in the spring of 1848 Hungary was no less ripe

for a great rising than the country subsequently proved to be in the summer of 1866.

What had the court to counterpose to the mighty centrifugalist forces of all these nations, every one of which, with the solitary exception of the Magyars, looked yearningly towards men of the same blood dwelling beyond the imperial frontier. It was no use counting upon German culture, for this, however indispensable to the social life of the Austrian empire, could never develop its characteristic energies under such a government as was now in power. Still less could help be expected from the bureaucracy. It was extolled by Metternich because it was free from that "excess of paltry elements" peculiar to the Prussian officialdom. Beyond question, no one would ever suspect the Austrian privy councillors and governmental councillors of entertaining any original ideas; but who in time of danger could put any trust in this soulless, negligent, and venal gang of writers? The main prop of the realm was the army, which maintained its ancient pride even under Metternich's unmartial regime. Especially was this true of the German officers, who continued to flock to the Austrian standard from the lesser German states and from the Catholic provinces of Prussia, and whose only homeland was beneath the black-and-yellow standard. But it was no longer possible to count upon the loyalty of the Magyar troops and of some of the Polish regiments.

Austria's whole future now rested upon the army. Nowhere was this more crudely manifested than in Italy, which for years had been held under restraint solely by a continuous state of siege. It was indeed an elevating spectacle, the way in which the two great nations of Central Europe were simultaneously aspiring towards the fulfilment of their destiny, were simultaneously aiming at the luminous goal of national unity, both alike permeated with the proud consciousness that they represented the idealism of mankind. The nationalist movement displayed many kindred traits on the hither side and on the further side of the Alps, showing in both regions the same youthful enthusiasm and the same visionary obscurity. The power of republican memories and the excellent justification for their existence in the classic land of the city states made it more difficult for the Italians than it was for the Germans to see through the illusions of radicalism; and it must be remembered that in Mazzini Italian radicalism possessed an

incomparably bold and brilliant apostle. On the other hand, it was easier for the Italians than for the Germans to recognise the ultimate cause of their troubles. In Germany the foreign hegemony was veiled, so that the profound falseness of the existing system was fully apparent only to a few master minds. Italy suffered from the oppression of an alien power which from its very nature would perforce ever remain estranged from the civilisation of the peninsula; and among all the ruling houses of Italy but one was Italian, the house of Savoy. Every patriot burned with shame at the exhortation of Cesare Balbo: "Independence for a nation is what virtue is for a woman." Giusti at length voiced the universal sentiment when he sang: "Delenda Carthago! Expel the Austrians!"

After the tricolor of the kingdom of Italy had completely replaced the party colours of the carbonari, and after the serious-minded and vigorous stocks of the north, the Piedmontese and the Lombards, had taken over the guidance of national policy from the hotheads of the south, soberer counsels began to prevail. Piedmont, hitherto contemned as the Bœotia of the peninsula, had at length awakened, and now provided the Italians with their ablest political writers. Abbate Gioberti, in his book *Il Primato degl'Italiani*, preached a new Guelph doctrine. Just as so many German enthusiasts, led by King Frederick William, continued to venerate as the sacred archducal house that house of Austria which was the natural foe of national unity, so did Gioberti acclaim as a "gloria italiana" the papacy which had been execrated by every Italian patriot since Dante and Machiavelli. None the less, this cloudy neoguelph doctrine favoured the political education of the nation. It afforded the first indication of the possibility that Italy, by legal methods and without a violent revolution, could regain strength through a league of princes under the primacy of the pope. For this reason, the two Piedmontese noblemen who were now voicing Italy's hopes, did not positively contradict the ideas of the fanciful abbate. Count Cesare Balbo, with the austerity of the ancient Roman, urged upon his fellow-countrymen the need for moral regeneration, for becoming inured to war. Massimo d'Azeglio, in view of the disturbances in the papal Romagna, demanded carefully considered legal and administrative reforms.

Through the irony of fate, the strange dreams of the neoguelphs now seemed of a sudden to undergo fulfilment.

After the death of Gregory XVI, in the summer of 1846 Cardinal Mastai Ferretti became pope. The new occupant of the papal see, styled Pius IX, was a man of gentle disposition, well-meaning, but vain, and not overburdened with intelligence. In political matters his views were shallow, but he was Italian in sentiment (in so far as a pope can be nationalist in sentiment), and he honestly desired to live at peace with all the world. He signalised the opening of his reign with a magnanimous amnesty, and since the spectacle of a pope who refrained from sending his enemies to the galleys had long been unfamiliar, the nation in its haste was prompt to construct an ideal picture of the liberal and nationalist pope, just as the Germans had idealised the elderly Archduke John on account of a half-mythical speech made in proposing a toast. For eighteen months after the day on which the amnestied, holding palm branches in their hands, had accompanied the carriage of "the angel of liberty" through the gaily decorated Corso, Rome lived as it were in a state of perpetual intoxication. Again and again, Ciceruacchio the vetturino, king of the Roman mob, led his followers, bearing the tricolor banner, to greet the idolised pontiff. Even foreigners succumbed to the universal delirium. On one occasion Marcus Niebuhr, son of the historian, a man in high favour with King Frederick William, carried the black-red-and-gold flag to the capitol at the head of an imposing procession of German residents. The cry "Evviva Pio Nono" soon became the watchword of every patriot. Metternich complained that this high priest was throwing burning pitch upon the edifice of social order, and that ere long an envoy from the liberal sultan might be expected to bring the Grand Turk's respectful greetings to the liberal pope.

Once only, heretofore, had Pius been given the opportunity of making a political decision—long years before when, a bishop in Romagna, he had valiantly opposed the revolutionary designs of the young Napoleons.[1] Now, though intensely flattered by the manifestations of popular favour, he was timid and perplexed in face of tasks difficult in themselves and greatly ecxeeding the measure of his capacity. Who would ever have imagined that this excellent man was destined one day to become the most arrogant of all the popes? He dimly realised that certain reforms were essential, reforms of such a character as had been suggested in Bunsen's memorial of the year 1831,

[1] See vol. V, pp. 79 and 82.

which the great powers had so often urged upon the attention of the Roman see.[1] But he was pope, and could never seriously concede to any layman equal rights with a priest. Still less was he willing to place himself at the head of an Italian league. In earlier days, when the Roman church was still the church universal of the west, such nationalist ideas might inspire an Alexander III or a Julius II. But now, when the whole of northern Europe had for centuries been a prey to heresy, the notion of the self-maintenance of the church must necessarily take precedence of all nationalist considerations. Least of all had Pius any inclination to concede points to the enlighteners and freethinkers within the church. Though he disapproved the severities of the Lambruschini faction, his own views were strictly clericalist, and for the first time he became mistrustful of the popular favour of Rome when his admirers raised the cry, "Down with the Jesuits!" Thenceforward, from the autumn of 1847 onwards, he frequently complained that his name was being misused, and he issued urgent exhortations, commanding obedience to all established authority.

In his difficulties, Pius requested confidential advice from the great powers; and as early as July, 1846, Metternich did not hesitate to utter a warning against any "concessions." Reading between the lines of his memorials, it was easy to see that the Hofburg had no serious desire to see even the proposals of Bunsen's memorial carried into effect.[2] The chancellor showed a yielding disposition towards the Hungarian diet, and in Frankfort his policy was one of leisurely procrastination. He believed that Austria's dominion in Hungary was to some extent assured by the geographical situation, and that in Germany Austria's predominance was fortified by the power of ancient memories and by the hopeless confusion of party life. The Italians, on the other hand, were simply enemies; and just as in 1820 and 1831 he had had recourse to arms directly this vulnerable spot was menaced, so now did he hold himself in readiness to crush without delay the threatened new rising in Italy. He was prompt to realise that hatred of Austria was the common war-cry of all patriots throughout the peninsula; and since he knew that his imperial state could never join a nationalist league of the Italian princes, he bluntly declared that the only possible form of Italian unity

[1] See vol. V, p. 81.
[2] Count Arnim's Report, July 14, 1846.

was the republic one and indivisible. Again and again he issued warnings to the courts, saying that no Italian sovereign could ever hope to wear the crown of the peninsula; that the movement could not fail to eventuate in a general social revolution, seeing that the amnestied refugees invariably returned home as finished revolutionaries; that Gioberti, Balbo, Azeglio, Petitti, and the other so-called moderates, differed from Mazzini only as the secret poisoner differs from the armed assassin. He had no vision for the clarification of spirit which was gradually progressing in this noble nation. Now (August, 1847), in a circular despatch to the great powers, he mockingly recalled the preposterous phrase used at the Vienna congress, "Italy is merely a geographical expression."

As if desirous of preventing all possibility of a peaceful understanding, he appointed as envoy in Turin, the most important court in the peninsula, first of all, Prince Felix Schwarzenberg, a man whose arrogance was intolerable and who subsequently made himself universally detested in Naples; and next, Count Buol, who in point of overbearing ways was no whit inferior to his predecessor, and who in addition was quite exceptionally stupid. The position of the Turin court, wedged in between two great powers, was by no means an easy one. Metternich's judgments upon its doings were as haughty and unreasonable as his judgments concerning Prussia, a land of kindred destiny. When the pæans in honour of the new pontiff continued to rise, he said fiercely: "A liberal pope is an impossible being." Since he was unable to recognise the changes in the times, he entrenched himself, as was his wont, behind high-sounding principles. "Nothing in this world is durable," he wrote to Lützow, envoy in Rome. "Principles alone remain; they are not subject to the law of change, for truth ever is and will ever remain the same." The one immutable truth was that, for the benefit of the Hofburg, Italy must for all eternity remain disintegrated, unfree, and despised. For these ideas of dull and heartless oppression, Metternich found vigorous support in the German press, although in other respects our journals were beginning to throw off his influence. The house of Cotta placed the *Allgemeine Zeitung* unreservedly at the service of the Hofburg's Italian policy, perhaps hoping to secure in this way somewhat greater freedom for the discussion of German affairs. With scandalous eagenress did the Augsburg journal now reproduce

countless Austrian lies concerning the depraved and servile population of Italy. Venal writers implored their readers to remember the Romish pilgrimages of our emperors. Their boasts suggested the idea that the shade of Barbarossa was striding among the Rascians, Jazygs, and Hannaks of the Austrian regiments, and as if the imperial provost-marshals had been the banner bearers of civilisation in Italy. Many of the German newspapers, which had not sufficient funds to maintain correspondents in Italy, faithfully reproduced all these unsavoury items. Even in the circles of the Prussian officers the favourite saying of the Austrian comrades, "On the Po we are the defenders of the Rhine," a senseless phrase, but one calculated to appeal to German chivalry, was frequently repeated. Owing to these injustices on the part of the German press, to be atoned for in after years, for all the Italians, and above all for the Lombards, the name of "tedeschi," already stained by the myriad misdemeanours of the Croatian soldiery and by all the repeated acts of treachery committed by the Italian-Tyrolese spies of the house of Austria, fell into utter disrepute. The falsity of the veiled foreign regime poisoned even our relationship with the nation which stood nearest to us of all.

Nevertheless, Metternich could not count upon the unconditional approval of Germany. Naturally enough, many of the liberals were enthusiastic admirers of the liberal-minded new pope; and in all the parties there were to be found a number of talented persons to recognise the elective affinity between the German and the Italian genius. The days were not yet remote when all cultured Germans had been filled with veneration for two absolute æsthetic ideals, Italy and Shakespeare. No one, perchance, was more fully inspired with this æsthetic admiration for the land and the people of Italy than was King Frederick William. Like the romanticist painters of the school of Cornelius, his imagination figured the Romans as a "royal race" of nature's noblemen. In the beautiful south everything seemed to him grander and finer than in the crude northern world, so that he could even admire Italian liberalism, although, after the Latin way, the doctrine was in Italy far more than in Germany impregnated with the dreaded "ideas of '89." The king loved "the glorious pontiff," and he esteemed Pius happy because it was not the pope's fate, as it was that of the German rulers, to wrestle with the

forces of commonness. To Bunsen the king wrote: "What is there termed liberalism, as I understand from a perusal of Azeglio's little book, is, in fact, my own political creed, and I am a cordial supporter of the Italian movement. But in Germany the Azeglian liberals would be found upon the extreme right of the sensible and progressively minded conservatives." Usedom, Prussian envoy in Rome, himself an enthusiastic admirer of the pope and the Italians, was instructed to encourage the Roman see to undertake cautious reforms. When the Hofburg began to take strong action in opposition to the liberal pope, and when Austria, upon dubious legal grounds, went so far as to occupy the frontier town of Ferrara, Frederick William earnestly endeavoured to mediate. He had no conception of the ardour of national passion; he failed to realise the inevitability of the approaching war of independence; and the notion that Prussia could ever collaborate with Piedmont in joint action against Austria was utterly beyond the circle of his ideas. Just as he regarded the Germanic Federation under Austrian tutelage as an admirable institution, so likewise was he quite unable to fathom why the Italians could not dwell in harmony with the sage house of Austria. His beloved Italians must never depart from the letter of the sacred Viennese treaties. When revolutionary passion could no longer be restrained, he dolorously declared: "Vulgar and fly-blown liberalism is now in the ascendant; tragic will be the issue, and that full soon!" [1]

None the less, he confined himself to the role of the compassionate onlooker. France was much more closely affected by the troubles in Italy. Since the entente cordiale had been ruptured, and since Palmerston had been thirsting for revenge on account of the Spanish marriages, Louis Philippe had been endeavouring more strenuously than before to win the favour of Austria. Twice during these last anxious months he had despatched to Vienna the notorious secret agent Klindworth, of Brunswick fame, to pave the way for a complete understanding; and in the struggle against Italian unity, at least, the two courts were of one mind. Just as the Hofburg was able to maintain its Lombardo-Venetic kingdom only through keeping the Italians in a state of permanent nonage, so did the Tuileries cling to the Old French principle that the power of France was based upon the nullity of neighbouring peoples.

[1] King Frederick William to Bunsen, November 11, 1847.

To Metternich's delight, Guizot implored the reform party of the peninsula to preserve for their movement a Roman, a Tuscan, and a Piedmontese character, for, he said, to propound an Italian question would signify revolution! Nevertheless, French statecraft, jaundiced by envy, could not wholly coincide with the policy of Austrian authoritarianism. The greedy rivalry between these two powers for the mastery of Italy had its roots too deeply implanted in ancient history. Louis Philippe, moreover, though talk of "a policy of repression" was now ever on his lips, was unable wholly to repudiate the revolutionary origin of his own regime. "The French government," said Metternich to Canitz, "cannot be strong where resistance to the revolution is concerned; that government cannot range itself beside us in this matter, for such a course would run counter to nature." [1] Notwithstanding the parade of ultra-conservative sentiments made by the Tuileries, the chancellor never wholly abandoned this suspicion. As late as the autumn of 1847 he spoke of the bourgeois king and his minister as "a pair of utopists." In actual fact, Louis Philippe's attitude towards the Italians remained ambiguous throughout. For the protection of the western dominion of the papacy, he secretly assembled on the Piedmontese frontier the small army which two years later was actually to enter Rome. By his agency, King Charles Albert of Sardinia, whom he dreaded as the born representative of Italian unity, was made an object of grave suspicion at the lesser courts. He sent muskets to arm the Roman national guard, and he recommended the cabinets of the peninsula to carry out constitutionalist reforms. He was represented in Rome by Count Rossi, a high-minded Carrarese, whose activities in Switzerland and in Paris both as statesman and as man of learning had been those of a French doctrinaire, and who now occupied the remarkable position of envoy in his own fatherland. Rossi's hopes were for the establishment of an Italian league of princes under the primacy of the pope, and it is probable that at times he said more to the beloved Pius than his chief in Paris would have approved. In Vienna he was regarded as a worthless jacobin, and the mere presence of this one man as French envoy in Rome rendered a firm understanding between the two courts impossible.

Thus did it happen that Palmerston could pose as the

[1] Canitz' Report, March 5, 1845.

magnanimous protector of Italy. The perplexed Pius had turned to him, too, for advice; and Bishop Wiseman, the great Catholic preacher in London, who brought Palmerston's answer, was commissioned to hint that the pope should avoid placing entire confidence either in the court of Vienna or in that of Paris. Earl Minto, the radical eccentric and a personal friend of the foreign secretary, was now despatched as envoy to Turin, and subsequently bore secret proposals to Rome, where Great Britain could not be officially represented owing to laws of old date. Minto said scornfully to Bunsen: "Metternich won't like this, but an English fleet in the Adriatic will please him still less." [1] In Minto's train were a number of young fellows with no official position, and these with astounding impudence announced at all the courts the imminence of revolution. Nothing was further from the distinguished demagogues' minds than an honest sympathy for Italy in her misfortunes. All that they wished was to thwart the plans of Palmerston's foes Metternich and Guizot, and to promote the unrest on the continent which was so advantageous to Britain's commercial policy. Bunsen, indeed, who was always ready to be taken in by English cunning, however thinly disguised, was again deceived, and wrote enthusiastically: "The struggle for constitutions is becoming a matter of political religion, wherein England assumes the position of high priest." [2] Palmerston as high priest! Assuredly in no other mind than in that of the Prussian envoy in London, a cosmopolitan dreamer, could so preposterous a notion have come into being. Canitz refused to believe that in a race which had hitherto plumed itself upon sound common sense, "political fanaticism could ever become a permanent system." [3] Frederick William, when informed of the unseemly disputes among the diplomatists of the western powers, expressed himself as follows: "To put the matter as courteously as possible, the English envoys in Piedmont and Hellas seem to me ripe, nay, overripe, for confinement in a lunatic asylum." [4] Metternich had good reasons for his complaint that Lord Firebrand had revived "the old Æolus' policy of Canning." The statesman who had railed most loudly against interventionist policy was now

[1] Bunsen's Report, September 28, 1847.
[2] Bunsen to Canitz, April 16, 1847.
[3] Canitz to Bunsen, September 25, 1847.
[4] King Frederick William to Bunsen, October 8, 1847

intervening everywhere, was "le plus intervenant de tous." The English court, said the chancellor, was doing all that was possible to fan the flames of the universal conflagration.

Thus shuttlecocked between the great powers, the much-troubled pope was able during eighteen months to bring about no more than one notable reform. This was the most dangerous of all, for he created the national guard whose arms could so readily be used against the holy see. A secular consulta was likewise summoned, but how was it possible that the cardinals should really submit to lay supervision? The secular ministerial council, which was at length called into existence at Rossi's request, was afflicted from the very outset by an incurable malady. The whole policy of the curia was governed by ecclesiastical considerations. The petty interests of the Papal States hardly counted in the scales. The consequence was that the cardinal secretary of state, Antonelli, a resolute and perspicacious man, outweighed all the lay ministers put together. A feeble attempt at a federal policy was ventured. In October, 1847, the courts of Rome, Turin, and Florence—the three reform states, as they were hopefully termed—entered into a provisional agreement for the formation of a customs union. Palmerston, who had long been the declared enemy of the German customs union, instructed Minto to do his utmost in favour of the Italian counterpart, but with the proviso that the allies must adopt the saving principles of free trade. His main interest in the plan was that it was a move in the game of chess against France and Austria; but he hoped, further, to win a new market for British trade, seeing that the manufacturing industry of Italy lagged far behind that of Germany. The customs union, however, could only enter into effective life if it were to be joined by Modena, which lay within the proposed customs barriers. Metternich was not slow to give a definite answer. In December he signed a treaty with Modena and subsequently another with Parma, in virtue of which Austria became entitled whenever danger threatened to effect a military occupation of the two duchies. Well satisfied with his achievement, he wrote to Berlin: "We have chosen the form of a defensive alliance, so as to avoid the use of the word 'intervention' to which the cabinets have so rooted an objection." Moreover, the grand duke of Tuscany, despite his liberal leanings, remained a harmless archduke; the Neapolitan Bourbons were pledged by the secret treaty of

1815 to make no change in the absolute monarchy; whilst Charles Albert of Piedmont, in the days of his bitter need, had promised that he would never grant his country a constitution.

These artificial props of the foreign dominion might very readily collapse. An alliance was taking place between nationalist and liberal ideas; and Piedmont, the state upon which depended Italy's future, the only one dreaded by the Hofburg, was soon to learn how great already was the strength of this young alliance. Charles Albert, the royal procrastinator, half monk, half soldier, hesitated long. By inclination he was ultra-clericalist and legitimist, and yet at one and the same time he was an enthusiast for Italian unity. Menaced alike by the wiles of the Jesuits and the daggers of the demagogues, he finally resolved to give an honourable significance to the name "King of Italy" which the Austrian officers had once mockingly bestowed upon him. Resembling in many respects Frederick William, though the Hohenzollern ruler was a man of far more brilliant intelligence, Charles Albert nevertheless possessed what Frederick William lacked, a vigorous dynastic ambition. The threatening whitecoats were at his very frontier, so that it was impossible for him to share the king of Prussia's generous illusions regarding Austria's sentiments. In October, 1847, he dismissed Minister Solaro, an ultra-conservative; he conceded to the communes the right of electing communal councils; and, following the Prussian example, he granted comparative freedom to the press. These "Albertine reforms" were hailed with loud acclamations, for every reform in Piedmont was a blow directed against Austria.

Nowhere was this realised more fully than in Field Marshal Radetzky's headquarters. The veteran warrior, an amiable man in ordinary social intercourse, treated the beautiful double kingdom which he had to guard for his emperor simply as an enemy country. Neither he nor his officers would consider the Italians to be fellow citizens and fellow countrymen. Even General Ficquelmont, despatched to Milan in the summer of 1847 to give support to Archduke Rainer, the inefficient viceroy, agreed with the field marshal in the view that for the rule of this province weapons, and yet again weapons, could alone be of any use. Despite the intrigues of Mazzini's agents, even amid this enslaved people moderate parties were coming into existence, and Giusti was wont to say whenever

he heard the bells of Milan cathedral sounding for a burial or a baptism: "A brigand dies, a liberal is born." To the homeless lansquenets of the Austrian army all the self-assertion, all the intense patriotic passion, of the Lombards appeared simply ludicrous. Even General Schönhals, a highly cultured man, abused the Italians as traitors and cowards. Writing at this time to General Wrangel, Radetzky declared: "The revolution is engendered, not by the strength of the nations, but by the weakness of the rulers. The much belauded Pius is a weak and vain priest. He is a worthy soul, but is nothing more."

The mass of the people had little sense of the oppressions of foreign rule. Far otherwise was it in the case of the gentry. Every household was poisoned by a detestable system of espionage; arrested conspirators were cruelly mishandled; the press was muzzled; with the officials it was ever a word and a blow, whilst the troops had the domineering ways characteristic of forces of occupation, so that the brutality of the former and the arrogance of the latter were equally intolerable; on principle, every expression of nationalist sentiment was derided. Reconciliation was impossible. "Beloved brothers, your day too will dawn," sang the Florentines and the Romagnoles to their brethren in the north. It was only at the congresses of the agriculturists and of the savants, congresses which here as in Germany heralded the awakening of the idea of unity, that the Lombards and the Venetians were able undisturbed to rejoice in their sense of nationality. But wherever the Pius' hymn was heard, the Austrian troops took instant action. Blood had already been shed in minor street affrays. The universities of Padua and Pavia had been closed because of disorders among the students. The day of reckoning was at hand. On January 12, 1848, the tricolor waved above the towers of Palermo, for Sicily had declared its independence of the house of Bourbon. At the Hofburg and in the Tuileries belief still prevailed that the existing order could be preserved. Guizot declared that the Bourbons had absolutely no right to renounce their claim to the island. Should Metternich wish it, he was prepared to keep watch over "the ambitious, vengeful, and timid" King Charles Albert, and was ready in case of need to occupy Rome. He wished that the four great powers of the continent should jointly guarantee the status quo in Italy, and should endeavour to secure the subsequent

adhesion of England to this alliance. Even now, his last word was, No concessions![1] But almost at the identical moment the constitutionalists were victorious in Naples and in Florence. In Turin the *charte* of the July monarchy was proclaimed as the statute of the kingdom of Sardinia a few days before this same *charte* perished ingloriously in France. The destruction of the foreign dominion was approaching.

§ 2. THE SONDERBUND WAR. PRUSSIA AND NEUCHÂTEL.

In Italy, Austria was compelled to repress every nationalist and liberal movement in the attempt to preserve the status quo, which had in truth long since become untenable. But the Hofburg and the other great powers of the continent opposed with the utmost stubbornness the same ideas of national reform when they manifested themselves in Switzerland. These powers could then no longer appeal to any definite principles, but had to take their stand exclusively upon the rigid doctrine of an unteachable legitimism. The internal affairs of the petty republican federation of states, which had for centuries been an anomaly in monarchical Europe, had but little significance for the rest of that quarter of the world. Sober political calculation would have led the European powers to call to mind the prudent rules which, after numerous experiences of confederate wilfulness, the monsignori of the Vatican had formulated for their own guidance, saying: "Best leave the Swiss to follow their bent for good or for ill." In the Vienna congress act (article 74) "the integrity" of the confederate cantons was expressly "recognised as the foundation of the Helvetic system," and the neutrality of the confederacy was guaranteed. At that time the powers had instructed the cantons that were still reluctant to accept the federal constitution for the sake of the common weal, and had been recompensed for this advice by the gratitude "of the Swiss nation." Consequently there was no reason why this Swiss nation should be forbidden to modify its federal constitution, or to pass laws altering the boundaries between federal authority and cantonal authority, provided only the integrity of the cantons (which in reality no one proposed to infringe) were preserved. The question how far the sovereignty of the

[1] Arnim's Report, Paris, February 8, 1848.

cantons might be limited by the federal authority was purely a Swiss concern, and the powers had just as little to do with the matter as they had with German federal reform, which in like manner could be effected solely by the limitation of territorial authority. None the less at the great courts it remained an article of faith that the unfortunate Swiss federal constitution, with its limitless sovereignty for the individual cantons, was an inalterable form of political organisation, as indestructible as the "contrat social" of the radical doctrinaires.

Confused as were the party struggles in this classic land of the federative state structure, these struggles were undeniably the outcome of historical necessity. It was in the very nature of things that Switzerland should break off all connection with the outer world, and that she should abolish the ancient distinction between town and country, between master territories and subject territories. This twofold aim had been approximately attained in the year 1815; the confederacy consisted thenceforward of two-and-twenty cantons endowed with equal rights. There now began a no less inevitable democratic movement. Only in Basle, Neuchâtel, and a few of the other cantons could the vigorous patrician stocks, which had done such good service for Old Switzerland, still maintain their intellectual and economic predominance, for the middle class was now vigorously asserting itself everywhere. From the date of the July revolution it was becoming plain that Switzerland was tending towards representative democracy. Almost universally, the aristocratic small council lost prestige; cantonal authority fell more and more into the hands of the popular representative body, the democratic great council. At the same time, the aspiring democracy demanded a strengthening of the federal authority, such as had already existed for a certain period under the Napoleonic act of mediation, for the general welfare of the country.

The great powers, however, blinded by legitimist prejudice, took from the first an unjust view of this essentially necessary change in Swiss life. One and all, and with good reason, they were embittered on account of the untrustworthy attitude, alternately harsh and lax, displayed by the confederates towards the refugees. They took it as a matter of course that Swiss radicalism, which was in essence purely nationalist and was practically intolerant of all foreign suggestions, was working hand in hand with the revolutionary parties throughout Europe.

Apart from this, the old ruling families of Switzerland, whose great days were now drawing to a close, were all in intimate personal association with the great courts. Through the instrumentality of Haller, Hurter, Bernhard Meyer, and other fanatical ultramontanes, the Catholic conservatives maintained confidential relations with Metternich; the patricians of Geneva were old friends of Guizot and Broglie; the aristocrats of Neuchâtel were loyal liegemen of the crown of Prussia. The very name of "radical," which in Switzerland had in truth a significance utterly different from that attaching to the word in the adjoining monarchies, repelled the diplomatists. The foreign envoys held converse exclusively with Swiss conservatives, because the free and easy manners of radical society were uncongenial to them; consequently their reports home invariably had a partisan colouring. But the chief cause of the ennuity towards Switzerland which animated the courts of Paris and Vienna was the dread of a strengthened Germany. Metternich trembled at the thought that the German patriots might take example by the Swiss radicals. Guizot spoke with horror of Swiss "ambitions to found a great state"; he was aghast at the possibility of a formidable Helvetian unified republic, forgetting how absurd it was to dream that Switzerland could ever give France reason to tremble. King Frederick William allowed himself to be led so far astray by the legitimist timidities of the friendly courts that he was rendered unable to realise how closely akin were his own plans for German federal reform to the comparatively rough-hewn ideas of the Swiss radicals.

To the general misfortune, the political party struggle was further envenomed by religious enmity, which here, in a country where parity was traditional, could work nothing but disaster. Inasmuch as the clericalist party, since the days of the Cologne episcopal dispute, had throughout the world begun to spread its pinions, the Catholic free bailiwicks in the canton of Aargau raised the standard of revolt. The insurrection was a failure, and as a punishment the monasteries of the canton, which had been privy to the rebellion, were closed. Therewith the radicals infringed the federal constitution, which expressly guaranteed the existence of the religious houses. The canton of Lucerne, which was completely dominated by the clericalist democracy, responded by a wanton and challenging act, inviting the settlement of the Jesuits, who, though already permitted to live in Fribourg and some of the other

cantons, were detested throughout Protestant Switzerland. This invitation by the Lucerners, though it did not infringe the letter of the federal constitution, gave the signal for civil war. During the next few years the confederacy began to undergo segregation into two camps. In Geneva, Vaud, Berne, Soleure, and Zurich, the radical party gained control, whereas in Vallais, with the aid of Lucerne, the clericalists secured a bloody victory. The discontented minority of the Lucerners, aided by the neighbouring radical cantons, now (1844 and 1845) endeavoured by means of volunteer levies to overthrow the priestly regime, and subsequently Leu the peasant, leader of the clericalist people's party in Lucerne, was assassinated by a hired bravo. The second of these volunteer campaigns was led by Ochsenbein of Berne, a radical lawyer and man of an extremely rough type, who seems to have been deeply involved in the intrigues of the refugee demagogues. He did not hesitate, in a pamphlet, to extol the breach of the federal peace as "a manifestation more splendid than any similar manifestation in the history of any other nation." For him all these civil struggles were no more than "the eternal conflict between historical law and the law of reason, the fight between intellectual enslavement and free spiritual evolution." Ochsenbein, a captain on the confederate general staff, was very properly deprived of his commission by the military authority; but immediately afterwards (1846) he was elected burgomaster of Berne, and as such became president of the confederacy, seeing that for the next two years Berne was Vorort of Switzerland.

Meanwhile the seven Catholic cantons of inner Switzerland had formed a sonderbund, ostensibly for the protection of the federal constitution and cantonal sovereignty. In reality, the existence of the sonderbund was an infringement of the federal law, which expressly forbade any alliance hostile to the confederacy or to individual cantons. Even more definitely was it an infringement of the religious parity so arduously achieved in numerous civil wars. The same cantons which had once led in the struggle against Zwingli, and which subsequently, as Austria's protégés, founded the League of St. Borromeo, constituted the nucleus of the new sonderbund; and its most noted leaders were Siegwart Müller, the fanatical clericalist of Lucerne, and Bernhard Meyer. Once more it became plain that Switzerland is in many respects the most conservative land in Europe. The confederacy was menaced by a war of

religions such as has long ceased to be possible for any other country in this part of the world. The radical party now adopted all possible means against the sonderbund. Bluntschli and his liberal-conservative associates in Zurich lost their influence; there was no longer any place for compromisers; Ochsenbein and the radicals of Berne attained to leadership; and after a political revolution in the canton of St. Gall, a narrow majority in the national assembly was at length secured by the opponents of the sonderbund. "Douze voix font loi," said the radicals exultantly.

The twelve who comprised the majority were determined to expel the Jesuits from the confederacy as disturbers of religious peace, to dissolve the sonderbund, and to strengthen the federal authority. But for such far-reaching decisions it was necessary by the terms of the federal law to secure unanimity, or a three-fourths majority in the national assembly. Here, as in the Germanic Federation, serious legislative reform was hindered by an irrational fundamental law. Neither of the two parties, therefore, could appeal to the letter of the federal law. But the radicals, whatever errors they may have committed in the intensity of party feeling, were fighting on behalf of the sound conservative idea of Swiss federal unity, which would infallibly have been destroyed by the sonderbund. For these reasons, when civil war was imminent, the conservative General Dufour of Geneva, and Colonels Burckhardt, Ziegler, and Donats, likewise conservatives, were not slow to offer their services to the radical majority of twelve. The declared radicals, Ochsenbein of Berne and Druey of Vaud, were joined by republican statesmen of bourgeois-democratic views, by such men as Munzinger of Soleure, Furrer of Zurich, Näff of St. Gall, Kern, and others. Unity or the break up of the confederation, such were the alternatives. The issue of the struggle could hardly be dubious, for the majority cantons surrounded the sonderbund on all sides, and possessed approximately a fourfold superiority in population and financial resources. Vanished long since was the time when the four forest cantons had possessed in their mercenaries, veteran campaigners, the best warlike forces in Switzerland.

With blind animosity which recalled the days of the Carlsbad decrees, the courts of Vienna, Berlin, and Paris condemned these Swiss disorders, which were in truth far from easy for foreigners to understand. The czar's attitude was

one of comparative reserve, for he did not wish to break with England as long as the greatly desired war of annihilation against the revolution still seemed impossible. As for Palmerston, he was impatiently awaiting the moment when he could effect a ludicrous exposure of Metternich's and Guizot's infatuation. At the Viennese court the possibility of armed intervention had been seriously debated since the year 1845. Metternich condemned as sheer spoliation the suppression of the monasteries in Aargau; he solemnly congratulated his trusty friends in Lucerne upon their defeat of the volunteers; and although he recognised that there were objections to admitting the Jesuits into Lucerne, he contended that the religious dispute was a mere pretext, and that the real purpose of the brazen-faced radicals was to transform Switzerland, under the cloak of neutrality, into a focus of European anarchy, and to reestablish with a revolutionary "central government" the one and indivisible Helvetian republic of jacobin times. He ascribed all possible wickednesses to this "intriguing and incendiary system," above all since the notorious Ochsenbein had become the official head of the confederacy.[1]

In reality the impossible idea of a Helvetian unified state was cherished by none but a few isolated hotspurs among the Young Swiss. Most of the radicals were animated by the federalistic notions which were in the very air of Switzerland; they did not wish to endanger the integrity of the cantons or to destroy the sovereignty of the cantonal authorities, upon which, as the event showed, they wished merely to impose definite restrictions. But in Metternich's view, even these moderate designs could not fail to set a dangerous example to the Germans. In Viennese court circles, therefore, there was general enthusiasm on behalf of the sonderbund. Prince Friedrich Schwarzenberg, the Carlist lansquenet, placed his sword at the disposal of the original cantons. Even Archduke John, though admired of the German liberals as one of their own way of thinking for the sake of his semi-mythical speech at Cologne, fiercely demanded armed intervention against a principle so universally subversive. The cantons forming the sonderbund were not ashamed to ask the neighbouring powers to supply them with money and arms for use against their fellow countrymen. In the autumn of 1846, Bernhard Meyer

[1] Canitz' Reports, January 19, April 12 and 24; Bunsen's Report, March 15. 1845.

was lucky enough to secure a consignment of rifles from King Charles Albert, barely a year before the Piedmontese ruler made a change of front, and inaugurated the Italian revolution with his Albertine reforms. Two other consignments of arms, one from Vienna and one from Paris, were seized. The sum of fifty thousand francs sent to the sonderbund through the instrumentality of Archduke Rainer, viceroy of the Lombardo-Venetian kingdom, failed to arrive in time. The Viennese court sent a brigade to the Vorarlberg frontier, with the avowed intention of overawing the majority of twelve or compelling them to divide their fighting forces.[1] Field Marshal Radetzky was ordered to hold himself in readiness to send troops into Ticino at any moment ; in April, 1847, when the plenipotentiaries of the cantons visited Vienna for a postal conference, Metternich did not hesitate, in a formal address, to urge the sonderbund to hold out.

Thus even before the civil war had begun, the powers were grossly infringing the guaranteed neutrality of the confederacy. From the very first they declared themselves in favour of one of the two contending parties, though the rights of the dispute were, to say the least of it, obscure. They failed to recognise that their unjust enmity was exciting the hatred of the entire liberal world of Europe, and that it was giving to the nationalist constitutional struggle a cosmopolitan and radical stamp which did not properly attach to it. Metternich, at times, positively behaved like a lunatic. When the outbreak of war was imminent, he declared that history could furnish no precedent for so absolute a denial of the principles of social order ! Yet what loss would it be to Europe were the bull of Uri forced to draw back a little in face of the no less venerable banner of the confederates ? Fortunately, however, everything which Metternich now undertook was affected with the weakness of senility, so that he did not get beyond secret incitations and paltry alms. For many years, in countless diplomatic notes, the powers had preached to the confederates, unity, harmony, and moderation. But in October, 1847, the representatives of the sonderbund at the national assembly declared war.

Guizot promptly drafted a proposal to mediate in the name of the five powers, most of whose envoys had already left the Vorort Berne, finding Ochsenbein's radical rudeness

[1] Count Arnim's Report, September 29, 1847.

intolerable. Guizot's view of the Swiss troubles was identical with that of Metternich, and the French envoy, Count Bois le Comte, held similar opinions. But King Louis Philippe, whose influence was still decisive in the foreign policy of France, was more cautious. He hoped for the reestablishment of a friendly understanding with England, and desired in any case to avoid armed intervention in Switzerland. Guizot's note demanded that the expulsion of the Jesuits should be submitted to the decision of the pope, though Pius, who had little love for the fathers of the Society of Jesus, was far from inclined to interfere in this thorny matter. The note further requested the immediate disarmament of both parties, and recognition of the sovereignty of the sonderbund cantons. The aim of the message, was therefore to prevent the outbreak of civil war, and it could have no effect unless it were delivered to the national assembly before the opening of hostilities.

What a splendid opportunity was now offered to Palmerston to revenge himself at length for the Spanish marriages! Owing to the wide separation of the five courts from one another, the diplomatic negotiations took a considerable time, and all that was requisite was to defer the decision for a little longer, until the sonderbund had been overthrown by the forces of the majority. In September, Lord Minto, then on his way to Turin, had had a conversation with Ochsenbein, and was delighted to learn that the radical leader of volunteers had decided to strike quickly.[1] Sydow, the Prussian envoy, likewise took an accurate view of the situation, reporting that every day's delay would serve merely to favour the overthrow of the sonderbund. When the duke of Broglie presented Guizot's draft note, Palmerston was unable for the moment to control his malicious delight. In a brief and scornful epistle he declared himself astonished at the wording of the document. It was obvious, he said, that this was to be a second edition of the Cracow affair, and that nothing would induce him to lend a hand to the turning of Switzerland into another Poland. The reply aroused universal indignation at the great courts. King Frederick William wrote to Bunsen: "This witticism on the part of your whig friend suggests a surfeit of oysters and champagne. It is the offspring of Guizot-Metternich-phobia, the offspring, that is to say, of the most evil manifestation that has appeared upon the diplomatic horizon since the

[1] Bunsen's Report, September 28, 1847.

July days."[1] Ere long, however, the shrewd peer changed his tone, and declared himself willing to discuss a joint note. This required a further delay of many days, and meanwhile the British envoy in Switzerland, a youthful son of Sir Robert Peel and a personal friend of Ochsenbein, confidentially suggested to General Dufour that he had better begin fighting as soon as possible. There were further outbursts of indignation at the courts when this fresh act of treachery became known. Frederick William simply could not understand how this "Peelbube" [Peel-urchin] could be the son of the man who combined the good sense of a duke with the heart of a burgher.[2] Had Austria and France acted more honestly, however, when they had supported the sonderbund with money and arms? The utter falsity of the old system of guardians' congresses was once again displayed. The interests of the various European states were inextricably entangled, and in grave disputes it was impossible that the high court of assize of the pentarchy should ever be wholly impartial.

For General Dufour the English exhortation was superfluous. It was plain to his soldierly intelligence that he must immediately turn his great numerical superiority to account, and must crush the sonderbund by a quick onslaught. This would ensure victory, would minimise the shedding of confederate blood, and would avert foreign intervention. First of all the troops of the national assembly disarmed the canton of Fribourg; next they marched against the capital of the sonderbund, effecting their entry into Lucerne after a brief skirmish on the Reuss bridge at Gisikon (November 23rd); the original cantons were occupied, and finally Vallais was subdued. These things were the work of a few days. After all the uproar, the resistance of the sonderbund proved unexpectedly feeble. In the petty skirmishes of this brief campaign the total losses on the Catholic side amounted merely to fifty killed and one hundred and seventy-five wounded, the victors' casualties being nearly double this amount. There was no longer any strong popular support for the doctrine of unrestricted cantonal sovereignty. On the larger stage of modern life, even to the peasants of Uri and Schwyz their native cantons seemed small and narrow, and they were no

[1] Count Arnim's Report, November 22; King Frederick William to Bunsen, December 8, 1847.

[2] King Frederick William to Bunsen, December 4, 1847.

longer willing to offer up their lives on behalf of these decaying powers. The national idea was further helped to victory by intellectual weapons; the moral debility of particularism was no less irrefutably demonstrated than happened later in Germany during the Main campaign of 1866. Members of the old and distinguished ruling families of Switzerland, the Salis and others, were found among the armies of the sonderbund. But their day was over, and the fortune of war was no longer on their side. The worst showing of all was made by the incapable commander-in-chief, Salis-Soglio, a Protestant, and his aide-de-camp Friedrich Schwarzenberg, the lansquenet.

After his victory, the good Dufour was not fully able to control the savage religious hatred which had played its part in this mainly political struggle. In Fribourg, above all, churches and monasteries were defiled and plundered with iconoclastic fury. To many of the victorious cantons the war seemed an atonement for the defeat which the sonderbund cantons had once inflicted upon Zwingli the reformer, for the memories of three centuries back were here still tenaciously preserved. The men of Zurich compelled the defeated Lucerners to restore the trophies they had taken from Zwingli on the battlefield of Cappel. But when contrasted with what has happened in other civil wars, the violence of the victors seemed by no means excessive, and within a brief period order was universally reestablished. In the sonderbund cantons new elections now took place under the protection of confederate bayonets. The new national assembly consisted almost exclusively of radicals, and immediately decided (the pope venturing no opposition), to expel the two hundred and seventy-four Swiss Jesuits from the country. Next the assembly turned its attention to the reform of the federal constitution.

How ludicrous seemed the mediatory note of the great powers, handed in at length on December 7th, long after the issue had been settled. Palmerston had attained his end, and could permit himself another of his malicious practical jokes. Stratford Canning, the Great Elchi of Pera, had now appeared in Switzerland as envoy extraordinary, and, being a well-behaved Englishman, was endeavouring on the one hand to encourage milder sentiments in the envoys of the great powers, and on the other to warn the national assembly against the propaganda of European radicalism. He received secret instructions that if the sonderbund had meanwhile been overthrown he was not

to hand in the mediatory note to which Palmerston likewise had appended his signature. England, therefore, held aloof, and Palmerston could look on delightedly when the four other powers received a polite missive from the national assembly to the effect that mediation was superfluous, seeing that there were no longer two parties in the confederacy. This snub to the great powers was acclaimed everywhere with scornful satisfaction by the liberals. The result of the powers' partisanship had been that the fall of the sonderbund seemed tantamount to a defeat of the old order in Europe. In the chamber, Thiers declared that Guizot's attitude was a living embodiment of the counter-revolution. Congratulatory addresses poured in to the national assembly from France, from South Germany, and from Saxony. Jacoby and his associates in Königsberg solemnly tendered their thanks to the Swiss. Freiligrath sang:

> The highlands heard the first shot ring
> (Against the priests the first shot rang),
> And now befell the fated thing,
> The echoes loosed the avalanche.
> Three nations sprang to arms!
> Freedom's our watchword here as there,
> To-day, to-morrow, and for e'er,
> Freedom the world around!

To all the continental powers these Swiss dissensions brought mockery and derision, but for the king of Prussia they brought in addition a severe political and personal humiliation. Frederick William was too proud and too honest to participate in the secret furnishing of arms and money. All the more zealously did he demand the open intervention of united Europe on behalf of the threatened federal law of Switzerland. Swiss radicalism, which was on the whole little inclined to attend to the proposals of the cosmopolitan propaganda, was in his eyes the sinister parent of European anarchy. In the summer of 1846, by his orders, the following message was sent to London: "On account of Neuchâtel, it is absolutely essential to Prussia that cantonal sovereignty, as protected by the existing treaties, shall be maintained." When the double-faced character of English policy was now exposed, he complained bitterly that Great Britain was sacrificing Prussia, her best and most loyal ally. Canitz wrote: "The principles

guiding the British cabinet are in part a passionate hatred for Guizot and Metternich, and in part a desire to promote on principle every struggle against the existing order, under the pretext of progress; and the bankruptcy of legitimacy is its object." [1] Marvellously contradictory were the actions of this talented monarch. In Vienna and in Frankfort he straightforwardly advocated German federal reform, whilst in Switzerland he passionately opposed political ideas whose ultimate goal was identical with his own. How often had his father sturdily repelled any attempt on the part of the western powers to interfere in German federal policy, and had done so regardless of the consideration that the main article of the federal constitution was inscribed in the Vienna congress act. Yet now the son demanded joint action on the part of the great powers in order to preserve the unrestricted sovereignty of Uri, Schwyz, and Unterwalden! Even General Gerlach, who was already inclined to consider his royal master's "teutonomaniac" plans for federal reform far too audacious, was unable to repress the unanswerable question, "With what right can we refuse to allow the western powers to concern themselves about the matter of German federal reform, when we are ourselves inviting them to interfere in Swiss federal affairs?"

While the king was thus dreaming of a great crusade on the part of European legitimacy against the radical confederates, he was neglecting his most immediate sovereign duties towards the little territory in the Jura which was peculiarly dear to his heart and by which his Swiss policy was, after all, mainly determined. In extravagant terms he praised "the truly edifying behaviour, the splendidly pure Christian sentiments, the most admirable conduct, of my dearly beloved land of Neuchâtel." [2] He had good reason for delighting in the loyalty of the Neuchâtelois. The little principality passed its days happily enough. Like ancient Rome, it was an aristocracy with democratic forms. Admirably administered, it possessed universal suffrage for elections to the legislative body; but the principal offices of state were honorary, and were consequently monopolised by the wealthy ruling families. There were fewer restrictions upon settlement and occupation than anywhere else in Switzerland. Numerous foreigners, Swiss citizens for the most part, had settled in the manufacturing

[1] Canitz to Bunsen, July 27, 1846; September 25, 1847.
[2] King Frederick William to Bunsen, November 11, 1847.

towns of Locle and La Chaux-de-Fonds, so that fully a third of the population consisted of immigrants, this being a larger proportion than was found in any other canton. The old ruling families, equally distinguished for their general talents and for their hereditary capacity in the art of government, were continually justifying their predominant position by fresh sacrifices. The civic spirit of the Pourtalès, the Meurons, and the Rougemonts was testified by poorhouses, lunatic asylums, useful institutions of every kind. The leader of the aristocracy, Baron Chambrier, who had for many years represented the principality in the national assembly, was regarded by friend and foe alike as one of the most notable political orators of Switzerland. Touching was the affection displayed by these faithful royalists towards the ruling house. The name of legitimism, which in France and Spain had been stained by manifold offences, was by them restored to honour. Even after they had been sacrificed by their sovereign, hardly a word of reproach against the Hohenzollerns was publicly uttered. But the immigrants who had secured so hospitable a reception formed the natural nucleus of a quietly growing democratic opposition, and this opposition despised the dynastic sentiment of the native-born Neuchâtelois as unswiss, and condemned the aristocratic council of state as reactionary.

When the new king visited the principality after the festival of Cologne cathedral, the free people greeted him with such overwhelming cordiality that to every unprejudiced person it must have seemed that a republic of Neuchâtel would be a historical monstrosity like a duchy of Berne or a principality of Lucerne. Muralt and Ruchet, who brought greetings to the king from the national assembly, formed very favourable opinions of the well-governed and contented territory. When the statesmanlike plan of restoring the principality to its traditional position as an associated district had unfortunately been frustrated by the stupidity of Metternich,[1] the situation of the canton at the national assembly soon became a very difficult one. Neuchâtel continued to vote strictly in accordance with the letter of the federal law, and faithfully observed the ancient pledge which the representatives of the confederacy had to swear anew every year, "To live as good allies and friends with all the cantons." Strict observance of the law is always praiseworthy; but in times when the remodelling

[1] See vol. VI, p. 29.

of an outworn system is essential, strict observance of the law is politically sterile; and in this case it had become simply impracticable, seeing that the religious dispute was so disastrously intertwined with the political. It was impossible for the Neuchâtelois to advocate the illegal use of force against the sonderbund cantons, were it only because the radical majority in the national assembly was openly or tacitly hostile to the Hohenzollern princely authority. Just as little, however, was it possible for this canton which had so long been Protestant, for this territory where Farel the reformer had once taught, to espouse the cause of the Jesuits. The only course left open was that of a perilous neutrality, and this course was approved by the court of Berlin. When war was demanded in the national assembly, Chambrier made an impassioned speech (October 29, 1847), saying: "This wicked struggle is not so much a question of war as a question of murder." Yet he would not declare himself in favour of the Catholic sonderbund, insisting upon neutrality for his canton, and upon discharge from the duty to take up arms on behalf of the confederacy. The request was naturally rejected; inter arma silent leges.

With a little foresight, Berlin would long have been prepared for this turning-point in the destiny of Neuchâtel. But in Berlin the affairs of the little principality had been treated with shameful carelessness. The Neuchâtelois department of the foreign office, to which was attached Frédéric Chambrier, junior, discharged the current business of the canton with the wonted Prussian precision. Pfuel, governor general of Neuchâtel, the only Prussian in the canton, continued to regard his office here, now become one of much importance, as merely subsidiary to his military command in Westphalia, and he paid no more than occasional visits to the principality. For some years he had accurately foreseen that a reconciliation with the fanatical ultramontanes of Lucerne was impossible, and that catastrophe was unavoidable.[1] Being a liberal, however, he had no love for the conservative royalists of Neuchâtel. Canitz, like the king, was wholly immersed in designs for a great European policy of restoration, and amid these exalted plans he forgot a matter of pressing importance, the military safeguarding of the threatened territory. Several years earlier the two German great powers had discussed the possibility of

[1] Pfuel's Report to the king, June 25, 1845.

the despatch of Prussian troops. Metternich, however, had continually returned to the sapient idea that the eighty thousand Neuchâtelois would not be worth going to war about on the large scale, and that a small Prussian corps would be of no avail.[1] The territory therefore had remained quite unarmed. Not for the pacifist policy of this king had the word been written that we must find quarrel in a straw when honour's at the stake.

The neutrality of the canton was open to no objection whatever on legal grounds. Neutrality was approved by the Quatre Ministraux, the executive of the Bourgeoisie, which added a solemn assurance that Neuchâtel would never separate itself from the ruling house. There was no legal ground for compelling the prince of Neuchâtel to take part in a civil war in which both sides were manifestly acting in defiance of the law, and in a matter where all must be guided by the principle, necessity knows no law. But neutrality unprotected by the force of arms is ludicrous, opposed to international law, and unworthy of a monarch. How easy, too, would it have been for Frederick William, had he kept his eyes open, to fulfil his sovereign duty! Had he but held the Neuchâtelois guards and some other battalions ready, and had he but sent them to the spot directly neutrality was declared, he would have been able to maintain his incontestable right. Then, as circumstances might dictate, he could either have allowed his principality to revert to the freer position of an associated district, or else could have agreed to its accepting the new and more democratic federal constitution of Switzerland. With certain provisos this latter course would have been quite possible, seeing that the prince exercised extremely modest rights in Neuchâtel. The friendly courts of Darmstadt and Carlsruhe would not have refused passage to his troops had their permission been seriously demanded, and the reluctance displayed by Baden was due solely to Prussia's failure to voice her demand with vigour. Even France, which in other circumstances would certainly have been most unwilling to tolerate the presence of Prussian troops so close to the French frontier, being now the declared enemy of the majority of twelve, would have been unlikely to offer any opposition. After the July revolution, the late king had placed almost the whole of his army on a war footing in order to protect

[1] Canitz' Reports, March 5, 1845, and subsequent dates.

Germany's neutrality. The son did not venture to offer even a brigade for the sake of the Neuchâtel royalists, and then lamented his powerlessness! As a matter of course, the great majority of the Neuchâtelois would have welcomed with open arms troops sent by their prince for their protection, and the Swiss national assembly would never have dared to fight the sonderbund and Prussia simultaneously. As long as the confederates were still ignorant of what this king was prepared to put up with, they sedulously respected his power. General Dufour definitely refused to occupy the principality, although the king had left it unprotected. Even the rough Ochsenbein did not venture open contradiction when, in the beginning of November, Sydow, the Prussian envoy, made a verbal demand that the neutrality of Neuchâtel should be observed.[1] The two Swiss obviously were waiting to see what would be the fortune of war. But weapons alone could furnish defence against weapons.

When the confederates now proved victorious, a great shame was cast upon the king. He had done absolutely nothing to protect the neutrality of his territory, although in similar cases even weak states such as Belgium had never failed to take the necessary measures. His diplomatic movements, too, were incredibly slow. Not until November 26th did Sydow present a note informing the national assembly that the king would be compelled to regard any infringement of neutrality as a breach of the peace and as an act of personal hostility. At the same time Frederick William offered to mediate, and invited the confederates to lay their complaints and counter-complaints before a European congress which was to be held in the neutral town of Neuchâtel. What could such a proposal avail two days after Lucerne had fallen and when the sonderbund had been practically annihilated? The national assembly rejected the proposal for mediation, and challenged the king's right to utter an opinion concerning the internal affairs of Switzerland. The canton had now to atone for its sovereign's laxity. It was sentenced by the national assembly to pay a fine approximately amounting to 440,000 francs for failing to supply its contingent to the confederate army, and though these demands on the part of the victors were utterly illegal, Neuchâtel, being defenceless, could not resist

[1] Canitz related this to Knyphausen, as we learn from the latter's report under date November 12, 1847.

the claim. In this matter, however, the national assembly continued to show a certain amount of consideration, for there was no wish to affront the king to an extreme degree, and the correct attitude of the Neuchâtel royalists enforced respect ever from their radical opponents. No confederate troops were quartered in the canton. The amercement was moderate, the figure being lower than that of the indemnities exacted from the sonderbund cantons. Moreover, to preserve the forms, the sum paid by Neuchâtel was earmarked for the support of the wounded and the survivors of the sonderbund war. But the king, by approving the payment of this fine, did in fact annul his neutrality, and once more placed his princely canton beneath the supremacy of the national assembly. Immediately afterwards, at Christmas, 1847, Governor Pfuel returned home. The last Prussian had left the territory, and even to Knyphausen, the Hanoverian envoy, a man devoted to the Prussian crown, this voluntary subjection seemed "by no means glorious." [1]

During these troubles the conduct of the Prussian people was, unfortunately, far from worthy of its ancient reputation. In a monarchical nation it is essential that everyone should feel "my king's honour is mine," for otherwise the supports of the throne crumble. But very few Prussians had any knowledge of this petty Swiss territory. Simple though the affair was, the liberal press did its utmost to confuse matters by the introduction of considerations of international law, seeing that the canton, while it belonged to the royal house, was not part of the Prussian state. After the monarch had blindly taken the side of the sonderbund party, the foolish opinion found general credence that the Neuchâtelois (trusty Protestants) were slaves to the Jesuits. It was not only the Königsberg radicals who extolled the victors of Gisikon. In Berlin, too, Varnhagen and all the children of the enlightenment made mock of the priest-loving king. A caricature depicted him as shackled to a Jesuit. In these unquiet days it was taken as a matter of course that when republicans were at feud with a prince, the former must be in the right of it. There was very little trace of chivalrous wrath on account of the humiliation inflicted upon the house of Hohenzollern and consequently upon the Prussian people.

[1] Knyphausen's Report, December 26, 1847.

While the king was doing nothing in the affected spot to defend his sovereign rights, he continued to dream of intervention on the part of all the legitimist powers. The great European congress in Neuchâtel, which was to lead back the confederates peacefully to their old federal constitution, seemed to him the anchor of salvation. But how could such plans still succeed now that the sonderbund cantons had surrendered at discretion and had dutifully adhered to the radical majority? In passionate letters to Bunsen, he demanded the support of the great powers, and especially of his beloved England, so that his Neuchâtel might be retained for him; in default of this he might be "compromised." He had no feeling that he had been compromised long since. In extremely incautious confidential letters he endeavoured to win over Queen Victoria and Prince Albert to his cause. "J'y joue cartes sur table," he wrote on one occasion; but, he added, "one should do this only with equals."[1] Yet in view of the customs of the English court it was impossible that such letters should remain hidden from the hostile whig ministry. Bunsen was now an enthusiastic adherent of Palmerston's liberalising policy, little as he had inclined towards that policy in earlier days. He delighted to visit the splendid mansions of the great whig families, failing to notice how these kindly hosts made a jest of his Egyptian, religious, philologic, political, world-embracing dilettantism He referred so ardently to the indissoluble Anglo-Prussian alliance that Canitz ultimately thought it expedient to call him to order, writing: "Since in Paris, in Vienna, and in St. Petersburg, people seem to believe that for the sake of the understanding with England we make common cause with the man who is now British minister for foreign affairs, that we make common cause with him in Switzerland, in Italy, or wherever the radical banner is hoisted, I regard it as my unmistakable duty to make it known that such is not the policy of the king and his cabinet, and that therefore it cannot be the policy of his majesty's envoys."[2]

Radowitz meanwhile, far too late, had arrived in Vienna to arrange for the summoning of the European conference in Neuchâtel, and at the same time to submit his royal master's proposals for German federal reform. In the end the German

[1] King Frederick William to Bunsen, April 12, 1847.
[2] Canitz to Bunsen, January 16, 1848.

plans were shelved for the sake of the Swiss affair. Concerning this latter it was not difficult to come to an understanding. In case of need, the intervention of the great powers was to be supported by a commercial embargo, and even by the occupation of the frontier cantons of Ticino, Geneva, and Basle.

After these conversations, Radowitz returned home towards the middle of December, accompanied by Count Colloredo, to learn the king's pleasure once more. Frederick William was afire. He had recently given hospitable asylum in Prussia to the meritorious historian Monnard and to others who had been expelled by the radicals of Vaud. His view of these refugees was expressed in the following terms: "They are all liberal Swiss, by which we have to understand something very different from liberal Germans. The former are free-spirited men of honour; the latter, with hardly an exception, are constitution-worshippers, majority-worshippers, or intriguers of one sort and another."[1] Moved almost to frenzy, he looked upon Berne as the centre of European radicalism, that radicalism which had its associates linked right across the continent as far as Königsberg. Should the worst come to the worst, he said to Colloredo, Austria and Prussia must be prepared without further help to extirpate the breeding places of revolution. At Christmas the two plenipotentiaries appeared in Paris to take soundings. Radowitz brought with him a letter from his master, wherein the bourgeois king was acclaimed as "the upraised arm of the European monarchies."

The sinister impressions which Radowitz was to receive in Paris were far from harmonising with this extravagant metaphor. The Prussian embassy, Heinrich Arnim no less than his right-hand man Count Hatzfeldt, were noting with profound disgust how blindly this self-righteous and yet ill-conducted regime was ignoring all the signs of the time. The noisy reform banquets of the radicals were loudly voicing the discontent felt with the tyrannical "pays légal" by the unrepresented classes of the population. The shameful fall of Minister Teste, the murder of the duchess of Praslin, and many other scandals in high life, combined to show how completely the moral foundations of this regime of moneybags had already been sapped. In the chamber, Alexis de Tocqueville had given utterance to the Cassandra word: "Do you not see that the political passions have become social passions?

[1] King Frederick William to Bunsen, December 8, 1847.

We are sleeping upon a volcano!" Faced by such warnings, Guizot said with a superior air: "Two things only are of importance, the full authority delegated to me by the king, and the votes of the chamber. I have both, and if the outer world will not obey the votes of the chamber, I have cartridges to secure respect for parliamentary decisions." In a tone of complete assurance he gave the Prussians good advice, saying that as soon as they had created their united diet they ought to introduce the prefectural system as a counterpoise. The collegial governmental authorities were, he said, too slow-moving and too independent.[1] The bourgeois king was no less blind. One day he complacently showed the Prussian envoy the map of Paris, pointing out how the town was completely encircled by the new forts. Should any street fighting occur, the national guard would be sent first to attack the barricades, and should the men in the national guard prove untrustworthy, they would be shot down by the soldiers of the line who would bring up the rear. Arnim thought to himself: "If this ruthless and self-satisfied government endures, there can no longer be a God in heaven!" He compared the soulless regime, whose only supports were the specious legality of the year 1830, on the one hand, and armed force, on the other, to a damaged watch of which the key has been lost.[2]

Radowitz could not free his mind from similar apprehensions. Nevertheless, on January 18, 1848, a joint note was signed by France, Prussia, and Austria, demanding that the confederates should evacuate the sonderbund cantons and should acknowledge the independence of these—things which had in essentials already been done. The powers further insisted that a change in the federal constitution must be effected solely by a unanimous decision. What could such a demand avail at this date? Radicalism was already dominant in the national assembly, and, apart from Neuchâtel, there was only the conservative half-canton of the city of Basle possessed of sufficient courage to stand up against the wishes of the victorious party. The foolish document served only to display the futility of the old system. Somewhat more vigorous was the language of a Russian note dated February 13th. After supporting the declarations of the other continental powers, it went on to threaten that in the event of continued resistance

[1] Hatzfeldt's Report to Canitz, July 21, 1847.
[2] H. von Arnim's Report, February 13, 1848.

the czar would no longer recognise the neutrality of the confederates. On this occasion, too, the assembly's answer took the form of an assertion that the management of Swiss affairs was its own sole concern. The warfare of notes rendered Frederick William's favourite plan, the holding of a European congress in Neuchâtel, utterly impracticable. The only course left open was to carry out the threatened occupation of the frontier cantons; but before any agreement could be reached thereanent, the revolution had broken out.

Terribly had King Frederick William now to atone for the errors of this inane interventionist policy. His Neuchâtelois royalists had expected the best results from European intervention; their next hope was that soon and peacefully they would be able to secede from the confederacy, for their chivalrous enthusiasm led them to regard their monarch as invincible. How hopelessly had these loyal fellows misunderstood the situation. It was true enough that the national assembly would have been glad to avoid the dangerous struggle with the king of Prussia, but behind the assembly stood the radicals drunken with victory. They burned with eagerness to renew, and with better success, the volunteer campaigns that had miscarried against Lucerne. They had taken the measure of Frederick William's courage. They longed for the moment when they could fall upon the undefended princely canton and could purge the confederacy of the last foreign authority, an authority that was monarchical as well as foreign. The desired moment came when tidings arrived of the February revolution in Paris. On February 29th, a provisional government was established in La Chaux-de-Fonds, where the immigrant population was concentrated. With reinforcements from the neighbouring cantons, a number of volunteers marched on the capital, led by Courvoisier, an experienced conspirator, Ochsenbein's aide-de-camp. Royal troops could easily have suppressed the disturbance, but no such troops were forthcoming. The petty protective battalion of the canton was too small to be of any use, and was dissolved. On March 1st, the castle of Neuchâtel was in the hands of the rebels. Berne, the radical Vorort, trampled upon the old treaties of the confederates, refusing to send Baron Chambrier the assistance for which he asked and to which he was entitled, and unashamedly taking the side of those who had criminally infringed the federal law. With the aid of Berne, the princely regime and the council

of state were overthrown, the venerable Quatre Ministraux was destroyed, the ancient communal liberties were annihilated and were replaced by a harsh prefectural system. Even the academy had to fall, for it represented learning, and was therefore aristocratic. A rude democracy replaced the old and somewhat stiff but just, honest, and cultured aristocratic regime.

The unhappy prince who was responsible for all that had happened had to look on with folded arms at this execrable violation of law, for the waves of the revolution were now threatening to engulf him also. Losses of territory and exchanges of territory had more than once been the lot of Prussia, as of every great state, amid the stresses of war. It was however a new experience that in time of peace a Hohenzollern should permit perjured Swiss confederates and a handful of rioters to rob him with impunity of a beautiful country; it was new that he should expose himself and his crown to a merited slight, which is still celebrated in the scornful utterances of the winners of a bloodless victory. How often had the king, addressing his subjects in hyperbolical and wellnigh censurable words, preached the duty of loyalty! But what had he done for the truest of the true in their vital need? Requests and complaints, contrite letters, sterile protests, fanciful dreams of a European policy of reaction—but not the simple faith of the German, not the faith of the monarch who wore the sword of the great Frederick. Through weakness he had failed to keep faith with the Neuchâtelois, and by a grievous counterblow of destiny he was now himself to experience the perfidy of the Berlin mob. The storm broke, and many were to be the sufferings and bitter the struggles ere the royal power of the Hohenzollerns was once again to be splendidly reinstated after its terrible fall.

APPENDIXES

TO

VOL. VII.

XXXIII.—COUNT BRÜHL'S NEGOTIATIONS IN ROME.

(APPENDIX TO P. 6, VOL. VII.)

In E. Friedberg's instructive writing, *The Foundations of Prussian ecclesiastical Policy during the Reign of King Frederick William IV* (Leipzig, 1882), the Prusso-Roman negotiations of the years 1840 and 1841 were described for the first time upon the authority of authentic documents. But a portion only of the sources was accessible to the compiler. A magnanimous confidence for which I owe the warmest thanks has now placed at my disposal all the political papers of Count Brühl, in so far as they relate to his three Roman missions, and I am therefore enabled to supplement Friedberg's narration in many respects. The substance of the matter has already been given in the text. In this appendix I propose merely to supply a few details which would have overloaded the account as previously given.

In the Vatican, Count Brühl speedily formed an extremely unfavourable impression of the position of the Prussian crown. At the close of his first report (August 20, 1840), he wrote: "It is manifest that Rome has won, that she has fortified herself with opinion, and wishes to avoid sacrificing her gains. Prussia has lost, but desires to save appearances." He soon realised that Lambruschini, a man of strong feelings, was inspired by a peculiar animosity for the hostile clerics in Germany; for the Hermesians (although these no longer possessed any importance in the eyes of the Prussian monarch);

for the unscrupulous and "infamous" chapter of Cologne, a body which had betrayed the archbishop; for the gentle Sedlnitzky, who had always been a bad Catholic. Brühl had been instructed to make an immediate and categorical demand for satisfaction on account of the arbitrary way in which the prince-bishop of Breslau had been treated. But he did not venture to carry out his instructions, rightly fearing that to do so would imperil the entire negotiation (report of August 21, 1840), and perceiving that the state could do nothing to help a prelate who had surrendered his own case. The monsignori, without exception, voiced their confidence in and respect for the new king. Lambruschini solemnly declared: "Should France ever carry the revolution to the Rhine, Rome will not fail to do her duty, and I myself shall appear cross in hand" (Report of September 4, 1840). But the cardinals felt the most intense mistrust of "the so-called advisers" of Frederick William, and plainly had just as bad an opinion of Eichhorn as they had had of Altenstein. How strangely the times had changed was shown, above all, by Lambruschini's glowing hatred for Niebuhr, although Niebuhr had in former days been on excellent terms with Pope Pius VIII and Consalvi. The new Rome could not forgive the great historian because he had rejected the *scrutin de liste* for the episcopal elections, and because he had succeeded in maintaining for his crown the right of the "exclusiva." Unfortunately the crown had been incredibly foolish in the exercise of this invaluable privilege. It had itself summoned its deadly foe to the see of Cologne. Brühl, therefore, had little to say when Lambruschini mockingly pointed out that Droste was "a creature of the monarchical government," and that had there been "a free canonical election Droste would never have attained to the archiepiscopal dignity!" (Report of December 30, 1840).

In the earliest conversations, Lambruschini plainly disclosed the desire of the curia that Prussia should send a Catholic envoy to Rome. The king's faithful friend could not possibly agree to this suggestion. Brühl was of opinion that a clericalist in such a position would be wholly devoted to the Vatican, whilst a liberal-minded Catholic would soon find his place untenable (Brühl's Note to his Report of August 21, 1840). Far more strongly, and with manifold variations, did the cardinals urge that Prussia should receive in Berlin an accredited papal resident, who would naturally prove the forerunner of

a nuncio. It will be well to recount the reasons adduced for this step by the good Cardinal Capaccini. He said, with perfect truth, that Roman information regarding Prussia was under existing conditions derived, either from newspaper articles, or else from scurrilous denunciations (Supplement to Report of September 3, 1840). But it was hardly possible to overlook the grave objections to the proposal which arose out of the complicated party relationships obtaining in Prussia. Extremely striking to the Prussian envoy was the jealous manner in which the attempt was made to maintain the supremacy of the pope as against "this so-called emancipation of the bishops" (Report of April 27, 1841). When, in the end, Droste was lightheartedly sacrificed, the reason for this was in part to be found in the pope's sense of official dignity, which had been wounded by the German baron's obstinacy.

On the other hand, the pliability of the crown of Prussia seemed limitless. During the very first negotiations (on September 1, 1840) the incredible pledge was given that, should an agreement be arrived at, the king would appoint to the Catholic department of the ministry for public worship and education such men only as should possess the pope's confidence. Similar was Prussia's attitude throughout, in trifling matters as in grave. The king voluntarily offered to found garrison churches for the alternate use of the members of both creeds, and Berlin was to have an especially fine church of this kind. But since the Vatican was not satisfied even by this concession, the church of St. Michael was in the end devoted to the exclusive use of the Catholic soldiers.

Prussia had yielded ground in an utterly unprecedented manner. A compromise had been made to settle the dispute concerning mixed marriages. The placet had been suspended. A Catholic department had been added to the ministry for public worship and education. The bishops had been permitted free intercourse with Rome. When we consider that, despite these and many other concessions, an unsatisfactory understanding had only been secured with the Roman see after harassing negotiations had continued for thirteen months, it is impossible without extreme astonishment to read A. von Reumont's confident assertion: "Rome displayed the utmost good-will. Such temporary difficulties as arose came not so much from Rome as from Berlin, in which quarter various combinations were ventilated before the arrangement was proposed upon

which an agreement was at length happily secured. It need not surprise us that in Rome, too, influences were at work, and webs of intrigue perchance woven, to prevent an understanding being reached. But neither the influences nor the intrigues were of a momentous character." This assertion conflicts directly with the facts. How can we account for it? I know of no more than two possible explanations. It may be that Reumont was so complete a fanatic that even the boundless forbearance of the Prussian crown seemed to him inadequate. Such a view is incredible to me, for Reumont, though a convinced clericalist, was, after his manner, a good Prussian, and had an ardent admiration for the royal house. The other possible explanation, the one to which I adhere, is that Reumont, who, as is well known, was extremely vain, had a far more imperfect knowledge of the details of these negotiations than he imagined himself to possess. In none of Brühl's papers, not even in his private letters, is there a single mention of Reumont, whereas there are frequent allusions to von Buch, the resident. If, therefore, Reumont, as he asserts, was "attached to Count Brühl's mission," we have good reason to assume that his activities were restricted to the despatch of purely formal business. This limitation would have been in conformity with the modest official position he then occupied.

XXXIV.—THE LEGEND OF HEINE THE REFUGEE.

(APPENDIX TO P. 132, VOL. VII.)

The idolatrous worship of Heine which finds expression in so many German newspapers to-day is in no sense whatever the outcome either of scientific reflection or of artistic sensibility, for it is a mere matter of business. Unfortunately, many serious scholars have allowed themselves to be intimidated by these clamorous activities. Not content with bestowing upon the poet the artistic renown which justly accrues to him for some of his verses, they venture to acclaim as a political martyr this man who was anything but a hero, and without even attempting to furnish a tittle of evidence for the charge, they heap abuse upon the Prussian state for its cruel persecution

of the poet. The simple truth is that whereas Heine had no occasion to complain of Prussia, which made no attack upon his person, Prussia had good grounds for complaining of Heine, who unceasingly besmirched his fatherland.

Heine was a voluntary refugee, like the Polish poets, Mickiewicz, Krasinski, Stowaski, and many other revolutionists from Germany, Poland, and Italy, who lived for years unmolested in Paris. Some of them took up their residence in France dreading a possible prosecution; others did so that they might be enabled in comparative safety to pursue their conspirators' designs under French protection; others, again, desired to enjoy the amenities of life in the world capital. One and all, with ultra-tragical pathos, they assumed the role of political martyr, Heine being by no means slow to participate in this frivolous amusement of the radicals. The solitary injustice of which he had occasion to complain at the hands of the Prussian authorities was the foolish prohibition of his writings. He shared this fate with many other authors, and, as he himself tells us, he could accept it with equanimity, seeing that the prohibition tended rather to promote than to hinder the sale of his works. As far as personal safety was concerned, he had nothing to dread, any more than had Arnold Ruge who, though at war with the press police, was left personally undisturbed. The government had appraised Heine at his true value. Dreaded for the power of his pen, he was not dangerous as a demagogue.

Official testimony is now available to prove that he was never subjected to any police prosecution. When Count Bresson, French envoy in Berlin, acting on Guizot's instructions, confidentially enquired of the Prussian court what would be the upshot should Heine become naturalised as a Frenchman, the foreign office, after consulting the ministry for home affairs, made answer in a dry and contemptuous tone on February 17, 1843. Officially, ran the reply, the authorities had no information as to whether Heine was still a Prussian subject. "Aucune mesure de police n'a été prise contre sa personne." Should Heine desire to become a Frenchman, the Prussian government had no objection to offer, and if the naturalisation took place, Heine would be granted by Prussia the rights of a Frenchman. Reference was next made to the prohibition of Heine's works. Since Heine lived abroad and had taken no steps to petition for any modification, the prohibition could

be withdrawn solely by a spontaneous act of clemency, "et il n'existe pour les autorités du roi aucun motif de faire d'office des demarches dans ce bût." The ministry seems not to have been aware that almost all Heine's writings had been published by the firm of Hoffman and Campe, and that at the date of the despatch, subsequent to the Hamburg conflagration, the prohibition upon the publications of this house had already been removed by an act of royal grace (see vol. VI, p. 513).

When Heine revisited the fatherland in the year 1844 the Prussian authorities did not interfere with him in any way. Subsequently the situation was somewhat altered by the publication of his *Poems of the Day*, for so coarse were their invectives against royal authority that no monarchical state could possibly afford to leave them unpunished. Although even now no proceedings were taken, Heine had occasion henceforward to fear that should he set foot upon Prussian soil he would be prosecuted on a grave charge. Feeling this himself, when he desired to visit Berlin in the year 1846 in order to see some old friends and to consult Dieffenbach, the distinguished surgeon, he begged Humboldt's friendly offices, that the monarch might be induced to let bygones be bygones—though the bygones were of remarkably recent date. The king, though he had been so grossly reviled, was ready enough to forgive, for he could forgive anything to the author of Heine's earlier poems. But the police authorities declared, as was their official duty, that it was not within their competence to decide in advance that grave lèse-majesté should go unpunished. The king alone could settle the matter, and before he had come to a decision, Heine had changed his plans and had abandoned the idea of visiting Berlin. On this occasion, too, Prussia did him no injury, and thus it remained to the day of his death. The lamentable tale of Heine's "exile" is nothing more than a detestable falsehood which a conscientious historian should be ashamed to repeat.

It is obvious that Count Bresson's enquiry must have resulted from an application for naturalisation previously made by Heine in Paris. Did this naturalisation ever take place? Apparently, yes! The only possible legal obstacle had been removed by the definite declaration of the Prussian foreign office, and from now onwards the French government treated Heine officially as a Frenchman. In January, 1845, when

Guizot decided to expel from France the staff of the suppressed radical periodical *Vorwärts*, foreigners all, Heine as a naturalised Frenchman was the only one to be exempted. Arnold Ruge, who was at this time in regular correspondence with Heine, wrote in a letter dated January 26, 1845: "Heine is naturalised, and will, therefore, not be expelled." Ruge repeated this statement in his *Studies and Memories of the Years* 1843 *to* 1845 (Complete Works, vol. V, p. 401). Is it likely that Heine's most intimate friend should not have been accurately informed regarding such a matter, which was at that moment one of vital importance to Heine? Is it credible that the French government, which shortly before had been engaged in diplomatic correspondence concerning Heine's naturalisation, could have been grossly misinformed regarding the nationality of one of its own privy pensioners? The strength of these considerations is obvious, and there is absolutely nothing to allege on the other side except Heine's own assertion. In the year 1854 he publicly declared that he had made all preparations for naturalisation, but had in the end been prevented from carrying out this step "by the foolish pride of a German poet." Everyone must decide as may best please him what is the worth of Heine's word. In my view, his assurance that he never became a Frenchman has precisely the same value for historical science as his no less ardent asseveration that "through love for Germany" he had "suffered thirty years of exile."

XXXV.—LIST TO KING FREDERICK WILLIAM.

(APPENDIX TO P. 263, VOL. VII.)

Your majesty's envoy at this court, Chevalier Bunsen, assures me that you will not take it amiss if I write to express the sentiments of profound veneration wherewith I have long been inspired towards your majesty.

In the summer of 1835 I had the good fortune to come into close proximity with your majesty. I was then visiting Berlin with the aim of founding a great company to undertake the construction of all the Prussian railways. I was acquainted

with the then Major Willisen, your majesty's aide-de-camp, and through his instrumentality preliminary steps were taken to secure me the favour of an audience with your majesty. Unfortunately, however, on the eve of the day appointed for the audience, your majesty was summoned to Pomerania by the needs of the public service, and thereby I suffered a disaster which I have since then been inclined to regard as the gravest of many by which I have been afflicted in my eventful life, for I was deprived of the privilege which would have enabled me to justify my subsequent activities by direct communication with your majesty

Those err who regard me as an opponent of Prussia. If there be patriots in Germany, and I believe that their number is considerable, who are convinced that it is Prussia's lofty mission, by reacting against the stationary and retrograde tendencies of powers suffering from senile debility, to save the fatherland from the convulsions of a revolution or from the shame of another subjugation—if there be patriots in Germany who rest assured that through Prussia alone can the rebirth of the fatherland be effected, I am certainly among their number. But if such men are sometimes found in opposition to Prussia, this can only be because they are of opinion that the Prussian bureaucracy does not invariably keep this lofty aim in view, and that the spirit of the illustrious ruler of Prussia is not always identical with the spirit of the Prussian bureaucracy.

I am well aware that my politico-economical ideas (which are based far more upon experience and personal reflection than upon a blind adhesion to the theories of others), and the fact that I hold no official position, have from the first led learned pedants and hidebound bureaucrats to regard me with distinguished aversion and metaphysical condemnation. I know, however, that your majesty, thanks to your inborn genius, will have ever known how to keep your mind free from all the prejudices which have led your servants to form so harsh a judgment. I therefore confidently venture, in a matter which intimately concerns the advantage of the fatherland, to appeal from a prejudiced bureaucracy to your majesty's admirable freedom of mind and strength of intelligence.

I thus indulge the flattering hope that your majesty will view with a gracious eye the tendencies which guide my activities, and that your majesty will be graciously pleased to accept my assurance that I shall be ready to bear joyfully any

burden which your majesty in your wisdom may think fit, for the good of the fatherland, to lay upon my shoulders.

Commending myself to your majesty's favour, I remain, in the profoundest veneration,

Your majesty's most obedient servant,

F. LIST.

LONDON, *July* 31, 1846.

XXXVI.—COUNT CHRISTIAN BERNSTORFF AND SCHLESWIG-HOLSTEIN.

(APPENDIX TO P. 379, VOL. VII.)

Through the famous work of Droysen and Samwer, *The Duchies of Schleswig-Holstein and the Kingdom of Denmark*, the story has become current that Count Christian Bernstorff had proposed, after the fall of the Holy Roman Empire, that Holstein should be wholly incorporated into the kingdom of Denmark, and that the right of inheritance according to the king's law should be introduced into the duchy, while it was further believed that the duke of Augustenburg, singlehanded, had victoriously opposed these plans. But, as I have already shown (vol. IV, p. 427) Christian Bernstorff behaved throughout this crisis in a thoroughly upright manner and as a representative of the good German law. Since, however, the patriotically minded legend is repeated even in historical works of note, I feel it incumbent upon me to draw attention to some authentic documents which were published in E. F. Wegener's long-forgotten book, *Contributions to the History of Denmark in the Nineteenth Century* (Copenhagen, 1851, vol. I, pp. 332 et seq.). When Holstein ceased to be a feudatory of the German empire, the constitutional status of the country had to be reaffirmed by the issue of letters patent; the national Danish party at the Copenhagen court wished to utilise the opportunity and surreptitiously to introduce into Holstein the right of inheritance in accordance with the king's law. Christian Bernstorff, however, then Danish minister for foreign affairs, wrote as follows to his brother Joachim (Kiel, August 26, 1806):

"In my opinion the patent should be framed more or

less in this way: Inasmuch as by the detachment of a large proportion of the estates from the empire, and by the abdication of the imperial crown, the unity of the empire has been dissolved and the German constitution has become extinct, and inasmuch as by the same token the bond which has hitherto united Holstein to the empire has been severed and this province has been released from all relationships and duties which have hitherto devolved upon it vis-à-vis the empire—conversely Holstein has thereby been most intimately united with the body politic of the lands subject to the Danish royal crown, and must henceforward in all relationships and circumstances constitute a completely *inseparable* part of these.

"It seems to me that as little as possible should be altered in the hitherto existent constitution, and the less said about the matter in the patent the better. The crown prince insists that the king's law shall be brought into operation and the right of inheritance in Holstein be bestowed upon the female line. This appears to me to be not only open to objection but also supererogatory in relationship to the immediate object.

"Postscriptum. In so far as the introduction of the king's law is concerned, the crown prince has given his opinion thereanent."

Bernstorff, consequently, is in complete agreement with the duke of Augustenburg who, speaking in the council of state on September 3, 1806, said:

"Considering all that has taken place, I am humbly of opinion that Holstein, which has so recently been severed from the empire, should be declared a sovereign duchy, whose political circumstances and relationships shall be intimately bound up with those of the crown of Denmark, and therefore shall be dependent upon Denmark, though this shall in no way impair the existent right of succession in the duchy."

Whilst it is true that the duke of Augustenburg rendered good service in that at the right moment he upheld the succession of his house, the danger was really trifling, seeing that Denmark's foreign minister espoused his cause. The patent actually contained the clause stipulated by C. Bernstorff, and Joachim Bernstorff subsequently wrote to the Swedish envoy Oxtenstierna (November 1, 1806):

"Qu'on feroit tort à Sa Majesté en supposant qu'en fixant les rapports futurs de Holstein avec le Dannemarc Elle ait

voulu aller au delà de ce que des évènemens imprévus et indépendans de Sa volonté avaient rendu nécessaire."

It is therefore clear that C. Bernstorff is quite innocent and has been calumniated.

Incidentally let me add a few words concerning another Augustenburg legend. In the prince of Noer's memoirs, whose untrustworthiness is recognised by friend and foe alike, it is stated (p. 16, et seq.) how greatly astonished the prince had been at his nomination to the governorship in the year 1842. I can hardly credit this astonishment. I can have no doubt, and indeed the relevant documents go to prove, that the Augustenburgs had long wished that the post of governor general might accrue to their house. Since the duke had made himself impossible through his opposition in the diet, the prince of Noer was the only candidate of the house at that time available. An innocent admission in Franz Hegewisch's diary throws a light upon the matter. In March, 1842, Hegewisch travelled from Kiel to Copenhagen in order to solicit King Christian's acquiescence to the scheme of constructing a railway from Altona to Kiel, an undertaking which only succeeded through a ruse (vide supra, p. 286). On board ship he met the prince of Noer, whom he had known for many years. During the trip the prince confided to Hegewisch that he intended to beg the king to entrust him with the governorship. Hegewisch started back in alarm and exclaimed: "Then I am lost: if the king receive your excellency first he will be out of humour after the audience, and my petition concerning the railway will either secure no attention at all or will be most ungraciously received." The prince saw the force of this, and behaved most amiably. The couple agreed that Hegewisch should first pray for an audience, and that the prince should only appear at court after the interview. Everything happened as planned. This anecdote, written down quite simply and long before the memoirs of the prince were penned, by a faithful adherent of the ducal house, proves that the prince already harboured ambitious plans on that journey to Copenhagen. When he subsequently attained to the dignity of governor general he was quite unable to make a worthy use of his position.

XXXVII.—THE PRINCE OF PRUSSIA AND THE CONSTITUTIONAL PLANS.

(APPENDIX TO PP. 420 AND 422, VOL. VII.)

At the time of the Königsberg ceremony of allegiance, the prince of Prussia very definitely opposed all the plans for a constitution which were contrary to the testamentary draft left by his royal father. At the time when his brother, King Frederick William IV, was establishing the united committees, the prince urged that this institution should be developed to the utmost, and that with the inauguration of the united committees the work of reform should be concluded. Finally, in January, 1845, he made a vigorous protest when the plans for the united diet were disclosed, and earned a sharp rebuke from his royal brother.

The natural consequence of all this was that the prince was not invited to attend the sittings of the new immediate committee which, in the summer and autumn of the year 1845, was to deliberate concerning the proposals of the monarch. When these deliberations had been concluded, however, the prince felt compelled to give detailed explanation of his views concerning the future configuration of the representative system. On November 20, 1845, he wrote to the king: "You will not be surprised that it has come to my knowledge that last summer you selected a committee which was to elaborate your plans for a representative system." He then reminded Frederick William of the letter of the previous January, and continued: "My conscience does not allow me to fall in with your wishes more than I did on that occasion. I believe that my position entitles me to demand that you should examine my plan. This plan does not jeopardise any of the rights of the crown; it grants every corporation its fullest privileges, and avoids the constant recurrence of agitation concerning the financial question which is the most dangerous of all questions arising in the diets. At the same time it guarantees the maintenance of the provincial diets by the retention of their present foundation upon the estates; it guarantees to the committees the general consultation promised in the law of 1823; and, finally, it solves the difficulties involved in the national debt law of the year 1820. I lay these great affairs before you in the most

brotherly spirit, feeling that you are deeply concerned about them and grieving that I cannot accede to your plans."

The accompanying memorial shows that happy combination of firmness and elasticity which was to be so helpful to the prince when he became king. Without in any way giving up the political convictions of a lifetime, he was ever ready to adapt himself to new conditions. He had once hoped that his father's testamentary provisions concerning the national assembly would suffice. When the united committees had been brought into being he accepted the inevitable and advised that this assembly should develop into a representative Reichstag. Now the king announced his intention of creating a central representative body to exist alongside the united committees and the provincial diets. The prince perceived that his brother was not to be deterred from this complicated scheme. Although it hardly met with his approval he immediately set to work to examine the fundamental idea of the new design, and he asked himself the question: How can the living power of the crown, which constitutes the essence of the Prussian state, be maintained side by side with these three unwieldy limbs of the body corporate?

The memorial opened with the words: "Prussia's political and geographical position as great power within the European society of states and as member of the Germanic Federation does not permit the Prussian monarch to be cribbed in his free activities by the existence of constitutional institutions. It is therefore obvious that any institution which approximates to the constitutional, or might develop into a constitutional mechanism, is unacceptable to Prussia." In order to avert this danger, and yet to carry out the promises of the years 1820 and 1823, the prince held that it was necessary to keep the legislative activities of the estates and their consultative voice in financial matters strictly asunder, and to allot these functions to two distinct bodies. The national diet should deal exclusively with the national finances, whereas the united committees were to deal no less exclusively with legislative proposals. Thus would "their respective powers be kept sharply differentiated," and the discussion of the budget could not be used to enforce new legislation, or conversely. Accordingly there should exist: a national assembly composed of about one hundred and fifty deputies from the provincial diets, possessing the competence to discuss new taxation and fresh

loans; further, the already existent united committees should continue to exercise the right of proposing new legislation, a right which would be capable of expansion and would yet remain innocuous "since the dangerous money question would be withheld from their competence"; finally the foundation of the constitution, the provincial diets, should persist.

The memorial then proceeded to show how loans were to be raised in time of war. The king's advisers considered this question one of especial difficulty. But to the prince the matter was simplicity itself, for he knew his Prussians. He held that when war was imminent it would be impossible, in view of the need for secrecy, to apply to the national diet for a loan; in case of war therefore one would rely upon the treasury and upon arrangements with the great money institutions of the state. "Should a loan become requisite during the course of the war, there can be no possible objection to summoning the national assembly." During peace, loans should not be resorted to except in cases of the direst necessity, so that everyone could recognise the necessity, and disgrace should attach to those who should vote in the negative. Costly undertakings, such as railway construction, should be left to private enterprise. The memorial did not swerve from the point that the late king had had in mind the creation of consultative estates only. In conclusion the prince wrote: "The debates of the three representative assemblies must be purely advisory; there *never* can be any question of their having the right of supply."

In compliance with his brother's request the king forwarded the memorial to the immediate committee for an opinion (December, 1845). The committeemen, and in especial Thile, Savigny, Uhden, and Canitz, expressed themselves adverse to the prince's ideas, for the unification of the provincial diets had already been decided upon by his majesty, and it was impossible to withhold from the estates a limited right of voting supply if they were to take over the responsibility for raising loans.

In the spring of the year 1846 the prince was called as ex-officio member of the committee. The king commanded that the immediate committee should hold joint meetings with the whole of the ministry of state in order at length to come to a decision. As chairman of the ministry of state the prince had to preside over the discussions. On March 11th, at the

very first sitting, he put the question whether a central assembly was necessary, and affirmed that he personally was not at all convinced on this point. When all those present had expressed their opinions he spoke again at the conclusion of this decisive sitting, saying: "From henceforward I shall answer the question in the affirmative." Thereupon, with two dissentients, it was agreed that a national assembly should be called into existence. The subsequent negotiations dragged wearily on. The prince was practically always in a minority; the other members felt that any opposition to the king's plans was hopeless, though the majority cherished secret misgivings. On December 17, 1846, the deliberations were wellnigh completed, and the prince announced his intention of communicating a separate opinion to the king his brother.

That very day the prince completed the new memorial. He began with the sorrowful avowal that he could not see "the salvation of the throne and of the fatherland" in the institutions that had been determined upon, and proceeded to summarise his objections under four heads. First he drew attention to the defective composition of the united diet and now expressed a doubt whether this unwieldy assembly of more than six hundred could ever persist as a viable institution. The prince raised a serious difficulty which, so far as he knew, had been unaccountably overlooked by all the advisers. He said simply: "This assembly has two grave defects; it is unmanageable and indissoluble." General elections throughout the kingdom (election by the general body of voters, as they were named in those days) were absolutely antagonistic to the king's ideas. Frederick William agreed with his brother in this respect, for he likened such elections to an access of fever from which the people must be safeguarded, and he congratulated himself that his united diet was not elected by universal suffrage but from among the deputies in the provincial diets. The prince cogently maintained that the united diet should not consist of deputies chosen by the provincial diets; it could, he said, "be dissolved and be elected from the provincial diets once more"; it should preferably comprise the whole of the eight provincial diets, and could consequently never be dissolved unless fresh elections were to take place for the eight provincial diets. "Thus the new Prussian consultative assembly would stand on a much firmer footing than the constitutional chambers of other states, which

possessed the right, in the last resort, to dissolve and go to the country for reelection."

Such an assembly, pursued the memorial, could only be controlled if counterbalanced by an independent upper house enjoying the same rights and privileges as the lower. The plan of uniting the heads of the aristocracy to sit in a separate house (undoubtedly one of Frederick William IV's most fertile political ideas) had unfortunately not yet attained full completion; to the lively disgust of the Ritterschaft of the eastern provinces, the king had up till that time called upon a few only of the hereditary nobles, and had reserved his opinion as to the organisation of the upper house. To the prince's practical mind this hesitation was unpardonable. He said: "I simply cannot understand, if it be proposed to create a completely new representative era, what justification there can be for refraining from bringing this institution into being at once in a finished state, instead of merely writing that the most important details of the institution are reserved for creation in the future." He likewise considered it unjust that the loyal nobles of the old provinces should be mortified by disdainful treatment. The prince advised the king forthwith to inaugurate a proper bicameral system, to summon some eighty-two nobles to sit as an upper house, and to strengthen these, at his discretion, by granting them the right of voting as individuals. Such an assembly would constitute a powerful counterweight to the second chamber.

The second point which the prince elaborated in the memorial was his objection to the right of the united diet to vote new taxation. This right of the old estates had fallen little by little into desuetude "as it was fated do do. Prussia since the days of the Great Elector would never have become what she now is if she had remained dependent upon such a right." For this very reason the civil code prescribed this right as one pertaining to the king; likewise in the laws of 1815 and 1823 the diets were promised only a consultative voice in the matter of taxation. "I consider that the relinquishment by the crown of the right to levy taxes would so impair the autonomy and independence of the throne, that I do not feel that I ought to approve the surrender of this sovereign right."

Thirdly the memorial deplores that the budget should also be laid before the united committees. Such a step can

only lead to a misuse of the right of petition; "thereby concessions on the part of the government would become unavoidable, even in cases where the government's better judgment might have suggested a different course." Financial matters should exclusively be within the competence of the united diet.

Fourthly the prince attacked the unlimited right of petition which was to be guaranteed to the diet and to the united committees. Petitions concerning finance only arouse discontent; "no one will admit that he has too much money; everyone contends that he has too little." Besides, affairs of state, whether domestic or foreign, do not lend themselves to petitions. Such matters are already difficult to deal with on account of Prussia's twofold role as European power and German state. Onslaughts in the press against the other German states were becoming increasingly common. How easily might not "the tenuous bond between Prussia, Russia, and Austria, which by its strength has hitherto maintained peace" be endangered by attacks on the part of the estates!

Least of all should the right of petition from the estates embrace military concerns. In every land the progressive parties were endeavouring to abolish standing armies; they tried to reach their goal by devious paths, demanding a weakening of the armies or the replacement of regular troops by civic guards. Such endeavours constituted a special menace to Prussia because of her Landwehr. "This is why there is an obvious tendency to exalt the Landwehr at the expense of the line, to separate the Landwehr more and more conspicuously from the line, and to prove that strictly military organisation and rigid military discipline are not necessary to the Landwehr, but rather that the status of a national guard would become the Landwehr admirably." The progressive party would therefore urge the curtailment of the time of service; and it might very well happen that a majority would be found to support this demand, for everyone was urging economy; even the conservatives would not fathom the hidden meaning of such proposals. The idea was that the soldier should no longer be subjected to strict discipline and that the Landwehr drills should take place as seldom as possible. To this must be added the enmity against the officers, and the lowering of military status, especially among the officers of the Landwehr. "If discussions and petitions of the aforesaid nature are to be

permitted the united diet, and if the press, even more than heretofore, is to be granted its freedom, then the existence of the Prussian Landwehr, which has been the true honour, welfare, and glory of the fatherland for thirty-two years, will become impossible ! ! " Should Prussia be unable in time of war to increase her army twofold or even threefold, " then Prussia must descend from the height to which her army has raised her." Thus clearly did the prince envisage the very events which, fifteen years later, he was to live and to fight through.

The prince wished to deny the diet even the right of petition concerning the affairs of the diets. The danger of the right being misused was too imminent ; for might not the diet, supported by the press, be continually endeavouring to extend its privileges ? Could the Government withstand such a demand ? " Consequently the whole edifice of the constitution would be jeopardised—a state of affairs that no one could desire, and which it is still quite easy to avoid." In sum, the memorial proposed that the activities of the estates should be restricted to the discussion of draft laws that were to be laid before them.

On top of all this the prince declared to his " great sorrow " that it was impossible for him to subscribe the patent concerning the summoning of the united diet. He was not antagonistic to the further development of representative legislation, for the old promises must be fulfilled ; nor did the time seem to him inopportune. His objections concerned methods alone. He saw the " rights, the dignity, and the power of the crown imperilled " ; he foresaw the danger that before long a constitution might be exacted by stubborn pertinacity. " Your majesty has often said that Prussia could never be granted a constitution, for in that very hour she would cease to be Prussia. We must therefore devise all possible means to prevent this goal from being reached."

Then, all unaware of the possibility of his own glorious reign, he pursued : " It is my duty to draw attention to the dangers. Yet another duty constrains me to this course—the sight of my son ! By an unfathomable decree of heaven it seems certain that the crown is to pass to my line ! It is, then, my sacred duty to see that the successor to the throne shall take over the crown with rights undiminished and with full dignity and power, as I see it before me to-day." Finally,

he prayed his brother to summon in council all the princes of full age, as had been prescribed in the late king's testament and as had been contemplated by the present ruler in the year 1840. Should the agnates not share his misgivings, the prince was ready to reconsider the whole matter. He concluded, "with heart profoundly moved and invoking God's gracious assistance."

On January 4, 1847, he added a postscriptum, for the king's plans had, meanwhile, suffered some alteration. At Frederick William's command, the committee had added a clause stating that the royal princes were to be admitted to the united diet. The prince considered such a proposition harmless only on the proviso that the estate of lords should deliberate as a separate and independent body; one must not expose the princes to the storms of a great assembly where "the medley of political passions would rage unchecked" He was not satisfied with the strengthening of the nobles' curia for which provision had been made. "The aristocracy must be wholly won over by being duly honoured; salvation and blessing can be secured for the fatherland in no other way than by the adoption of the bicameral system as an integral part of the representative institutions now about to be created."

When the united diet assembled the prince did not scruple to expose himself to those storms of political passion about which he had uttered a warning, and defended, in knightly fashion, his royal brother's government. A year later he accommodated himself, with the same self-denial, to constitutional forms. All the world knows that subsequently as ruler he understood how to raise the new Prussia to a yet higher plane than the old, and how he was able to keep alive the spirit and the power of the old Prussian kingdom even within the confines of the new constitution.

XXXVIII.—KÜHNE TO BODELSCHWINGH.

(APPENDIX TO P. 429, VOL. VII.)

YOUR EXCELLENCY,

I would very much like to have a quarter of an hour's talk (for it would certainly take that amount of time)

with you, truly not on my account but on your own, and in view of the importance of the question.

I am not one of those who wish to make others apprehensive, nor am I easily made apprehensive myself. You must concede me this, otherwise tear up this letter, and I will stay where I am, *i.e.* I will not come to see you but will voyage with you wherever the course is steered. But what hope have I of success? That will depend very much upon the talk I am requesting of you.

Whether the king *has the right* to say "thus have I commanded, and thus shall it be done or not done" troubles me little; I never fight over such things, they are abstractions. But what is the best course to adopt when we have to make our way across a place which has been mined in all directions and whose margins are crumbling into the current? I am, then, free to say that the difference between the periodicity of the united diet and of the united committees seems to me hardly anything more than an abstraction. You are devoted and honest, and wish to carry out your plans by suitable means (suitable in your estimation). But what of your opponents? Confiding in the good cause to which you have devoted yourself, you are valiant and unafraid in the defence of the position you have adopted (or have been compelled to adopt), and in warding off the attacks of those who desire to drive you from that position.

But what sort of people are they upon whom you have to rely?

You can realise clearly what is likely to be the upshot of the monstrous coalition; can you assume that the passions of contending parties will give rise to similar results? Prussia's future, the question of the existence or non-existence of the state to which we are both equally devoted, rests upon the facts whether the meeting of the united diet takes place quietly and in an orderly fashion in peace and unity with the government, and whether the assembly disperses, if not crowned with success, at least with the hope that *with the united diet and through the united diet* something better may be achieved. Should this prove a failure, and I say this as my inmost conviction, then we have no means wherewith to govern.

I am like the Jew Lipke who would prefer a blow from you to a handshake from another! But even if matters should come to such a pass do not destroy this letter, for it may as

well remain to bear witness that I have *perhaps* warned you in good time.

With cordial affection,
and most respectfully,
KÜHNE.

BERLIN, *April* 3, 1847.

XXXIX.—MEMOIRS OF PRINCE EMILIUS OF HESSE.

(APPENDIX TO P. 375, VOL. III, AND P. 515, VOL. VII.)

In the year 1823 Prince Emilius of Hesse began to write his reminiscences, but unfortunately abandoned the undertaking before he had covered many sheets. Some fragments which a friend has submitted to me seem to shed light upon the mentality of the prince and the characteristics of the Rhenish Confederate courts.

. . . . . the untrustworthiness of this heir [Crown Prince Louis of Bavaria], an aspect of the matter which few but myself have had an opportunity to study. Sympathetic, or at least appearing to be so, towards the French, he insisted upon cooperating, together with Bavaria, in the campaign against Prussia in the year 1806. In 1809 he likewise marched against the Austrians in Tyrol. In the same year I saw him come into the emperor Napoleon's headquarters at Schönbrunn, where I myself was stationed at the time. In the anteroom, with hundreds of marshals, generals, and other officers he was awaiting the emperor's advent. Hardly had Napoleon appeared before the crown prince dashed towards him and *kissed his hand.* Napoleon thereupon embraced him and said: "Ah, bonjour Louis, comment cela va-t-il?" He then betook himself to the parade ground. Such conduct was not exactly in the fullest concord with his subsequent behaviour in the year 1814. Then both France and Napoleon were an abomination, the crown prince was a German man, and all and sundry who,

in imitation of himself, refused to trample the fallen idol under foot, were called traitors or suspects. In the year 1815 this enthusiastic hero did me the honour of venting his opinions concerning myself. He marvelled that anyone could entrust me with a command seeing that I was a well-known francophil. This stricture upon me was uttered at a dinner party at a time when the crown prince was lavishing tokens of affection upon me, and often took his midday meal at my house, etc. When the criticism was repeated to me I could not refrain from communicating the foregoing anecdotes to the gossip, who was a hanger-on of the crown prince. I added: "It may be that I am a francophil, but I could not have stooped so to demean myself." When the campaign was at an end (a campaign during which I won the orders of Theresa and of St. George) I saw the crown prince in Paris. One morning he came to me, and with his customary display of friendship congratulated me upon my "success," saying in his stuttering and sibilant speech how delighted he was. I replied: "Your good wishes are all the more agreeable since I can assure you that there are people who are mean enough to have considered that a command entrusted to me was in dangerous hands." His royal highness blushed scarlet and answered: "Certainly no one can ever have questioned your military capacity." "No, but a doubt was cast upon my honour, and that was even worse," was my rejoinder.

. . . . And now I recall my sojourn in Aix-la-Chapelle, which was not devoid of consequences for me. After Napoleon's fall I was looked upon by a raving Germany as one of those persons whom it was natural to hate because he had been a whole-hearted supporter of the emperor and of France. This hatred was partly to be accounted for because of Napoleon's kindliness, for the emperor was always delighted to see young men, especially princes, eager to perform their military duties; on the other hand, it was partly due to a confused state of mind occasioned by excess of enthusiasm. Nearly everyone seemed to consider treachery towards Napoleon as a meritorious act. Seeing that I received no orders to transfer my services to the ranks of the enemy from the grand duke my father, whom alone I served and not the French, I could not allow such a

thought to enter my mind, for it seemed treacherous and would have touched my honour grievously. And yet it was owing to this sin of omission, and because I preferred to fulfil my duties as a soldier and to be taken fighting on the field of Leipzig that I am maligned. Subsequently I explained my motives to Emperor Alexander, and was so fortunate as to earn his fullest approbation. The Austrian emperor and the Austrians generally have likewise treated me with consideration. In the two campaigns against France which I made in the armies of the allies I won the following distinctions: the grand cross of the Leopold Order; the lesser Maria Theresa order; and the Cor cross of the St. George order. Notwithstanding all this, a number of persons of note were prejudiced against me. I therefore considered the meeting at Aix-la-Chapelle to be a very suitable place for a demonstration of my intention to take a firm stand, and to be afraid of nobody. I quickly made up my mind to journey to Aix, where I arrived towards the middle of the proceedings . . . .

. . . . . .

A morning or two after my arrival I took suitable measures to secure audience of the emperor of Austria and of the king of Prussia. The former received me with especial favour, a favour which he continued to bestow upon me during the whole of my subsequent sojourn, nay, which even increased with the passing days, so that at least twice a week I received an invitation to sit at board with him. Generally speaking the emperor and his whole entourage treated me with the distinction and kindliness which are ever attributed to the Austrians. The king of Prussia, naturally undemonstrative, seemed to find it impossible to throw off a prejudice dating from some time back, and preserved a somewhat stiff demeanour. I may have succeeded, during the course of my stay, by my impartiality and by the explanations I was able to give some members of his suite, in breaking down the king's illusion. At any rate, each successive reception was kindlier and more benevolent. Hardly conceivable is the way in which intelligent people will give credence to widely diffused reports, reports which bear the imprint of inveracity and whose only possible place is in a pamphlet. Among such is the anecdote that during the battle of Lützen Napoleon is alleged to have called

out to me: "En avant, roi de Prusse!" Preposterous and laughable as the tale is, it found credence and, apparently, took root in the king's mind, for Frederick William always showed himself ill-disposed towards me, especially after I was taken prisoner at Leipzig. I had hardly been a week at Aix-la-Chapelle when this fairy tale was resuscitated in an Antwerp newspaper. The unpleasant affair, perhaps instigated by deliberate malice, was utilised by me in order to relate the truth concerning my relationships with the French and the reasons for my reserved behaviour. I told all this to Prince Metternich, to Prince Hardenberg, and to many others, and experienced a veritable triumph. Not only did I gain the cordial approval of all these men, but from thenceforth I seemed to notice a sort of special kindliness towards myself, and, what is more, a respect which it had been my endeavour from the very outset to acquire.

LIBRARY OF
LAMAR STATE COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY

INDEX

A.

Abdul-Medjid, Sultan of Turkey, 332, 333
Abel, Carl, 16, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 55, 57, 59, 60, 61, 62, 64, 66, 73, 76, 224, 226, 244, 252, 475, 476, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 484, 485, 490, 504
Abel, Otto, 173
Aberdeen, 213, 218, 234, 250, 272, 273, 317, 321, 322, 325, 329, 417
Achterfeldt, 32
Adalbert, Prince of Prussia, 271, 274, 326
"Adam I, King of Poland," see Czartoryski
Adam Smith, see Smith
Adler, 368, 381, 394
Adolphus, Duke of Nassau, 42, 508, 515
Aegidi, 524
Æschylus, 172
Agnes, Saint, 63
Albert, Prince Consort, 218, 234, 322, 323, 417, 498, 528, 529, 530, 544, 545, 587
Albert Edward, Prince of Wales, 209
Alexander I, Czar of Russia, 238, 614
Alexander the Great, 172
Alexander III, Pope, 561
Alexander Karageorgevitch, 332
Alexandra, Grand Duchess of Russia and Landgravine of Hesse-Cassel, 370, 371
Alexandra Feodorovna, Empress of Russia, 421
Alexandrina, see Alexandra
Alexis, 139, 140, 144, 164
Allgemeine Zeitung (Augsburg), 223, 231, 248, 335, 485, 562
Allgemeine Zeitung, see also *Preussische Allgemeine Zeitung*
Altenhof, see Reventlow-Altenhof
Altenstein, 6, 96, 97, 593
Alvensleben, 208, 212, 278
Amelia, Princess of Oldenburg (later Queen of Greece), 325
Ammon, 89
Amsberg, 212, 280, 281, 283
Andlaw, 66
Andrian, 551
Anhalt-Coethen, Duchess of, see Julia
Anhalt-Coethen, Duke of, see Ferdinand
Anhalt-Dessau, Prince of, see Leopold I
Annali universali di statistica, 253
Anneke, 401
Antoine Marie Philippe Louis of Orleans, Duke of Montpensier, 543, 544, 546, 547, 548, 549
Antonelli, 567
Antony, King of Saxony, 86
Apponyi, 356
Archenholz, 164
Argyll, 260
Aristophanes, 172
Aristotle, 190
Armansperg, 325
Arminius, 53
Arndt, 36, 123, 437, 467
Arnim, Achim, 409, 410
Arnim, Adolf Heinrich (Arnim of Boitzenburg), 27, 111, 241, 291, 292, 313, 416, 425, 434, 437, 438, 440, 470
Arnim, Bettina, 186
Arnim, Heinrich Alexander, 234, 235, 236, 266, 274, 326, 549, 570, 588, 589
Arnim, Heinrich Friedrich, 304, 305, 306, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 357, 361, 391, 394, 483, 534, 552, 561, 576, 578
Arnoldi, 5, 17, 19, 20, 21, 77, 78
Arragon, King of, see Ferdinand V
Ascheraden, see Schoultz-Ascheraden
Assisi, see Francis
Aster, 51, 277
Atterdag, see Waldemar IV
Auerbach, 140, 141, 142
Auersperg, see Grün, Anastasius
Auerswald, 440, 460
Auerweck, 60
Augusta, Electress of Hesse-Cassel, 492, 494
Augustenburg, see Schleswig-Holstein-Sonderburg-Augustenburg
Augustenburg, Duke of, see Christian Charles, etc.
Augustus, Prince of Würtemberg, 503
Augustus II, the Strong, Elector of Saxony and King of Poland, 86

Augustus (Paul Frederick), Grand Duke of Oldenburg, 384, 500
Aulicke, 31
Austria, Archduchess of, see Sophia
Austria, Archduke of, see Ferdinand, John, Joseph, Francis Joseph, Louis, Rainer, Stephen
Austria, Emperor of, see Ferdinand I, Francis
Austria, Empress of, see Caroline Augusta
Austria-Este, Archduke of, see Max
Azeglio, 559, 562, 564

B.

Bacon, 191
Baden, Grand Duchess of, see Sophia
Baden, Grand Duke of, see Leopold, Louis William Augustus
Baden, Hereditary Prince of, see Louis
Baden, Margrave of, see Maximilian, William
Baden, Prince of, see Frederick
Baden, Gustav Ludwig, 374
Baden, Jacob, 374
Baier-Bürck, 149
Bakunin, 303
Balbo, 559, 562
Baltzer, 108
Bandel, 371
Bardeleben, 466
Bardenfleth, 396
Barthold, 56
Bassermann, 69, 70, 140, 512, 514, 523, 524
Baudri, 33
Bauer, Bruno, 123
Bauer, Edgar, 123
Baum, 71
Baur, 43
Bavaria, Crown Prince of, see Maximilian
Bavaria, Elector of, see Maximilian I
Bavaria, King of, see Louis I, Maximilian I, Joseph
Bavaria, Prince of, see Luitpold
Bavaria, Queen of, see Caroline, Theresa
Belgians, King of the, see Leopold I
Beck, 309
Beckerath, 413, 437, 438, 439, 442, 448, 454, 456, 471
Beckx, 22
Behr, 483
Bekk, 511
Benazet, 72, 520
Benedek, 342
Benedix, 149
Bentham, 254
Bentinck, 359
Benzenberg, 414
Beobachter, see *Oesterreichische Beobachter*
Berg (Oldenburg publicist), 215
Berg (Russian military service), 343, 345
Bergen, see Berlepsch
Berger, 212
Berks, 488, 489
Berlepsch, 492, 497
Berlichingen, 241
Bernard, Eric Freund, Duke of Saxe-Meiningen, 503
Bernayes, 306
Bernstorff, Albrecht, 45, 63, 64, 361, 478, 483, 484, 485
Bernstorff, Andreas Peter, 378
Bernstorff, Christian Günther, 600, 601, 602
Bernstorff, Joachim Friedrich, 600, 601
Beseler, Carl Georg Christoph, 376, 433, 501, 522
Beseler, Wilhelm Hartwig, 383, 386, 396, 501
Bethmann-Hollweg, 110, 113, 114, 118, 409
Bettina, see Arnim
Beurmann, 340, 341
Beuth, 201, 226, 229, 266
Bever, 244
Biedermann, 433
Biefve, 154
Billing, 388
Bischoff, 536
Bismarck, 83, 434, 445, 456, 457, 462
Blanc (gaming-house keeper in Homburg), 520
Blanc, Louis, 309
Blind, 512
Blittersdorff, 39, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 72, 73, 74, 284, 361, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 520, 526, 529
Blucher, 525
Blum, 87, 88, 91, 93, 94
Bluntschli, 64, 303, 574
Bockelberg, 514
Böcking, 223, 471
Bockum-Dolffs, 466
Bodelschwingh, 19, 20, 27, 93, 103, 105, 230, 244, 245, 275, 280, 281, 291, 336, 400, 423, 426, 429, 430, 443, 461, 465, 466, 469, 470, 610
Bodelschwingh-Plettenberg, 430
Boeckh, August, 188
Boeckh, Friedrich, 73, 507
Bohemia, King of, see George of Podiebrad
Bohemia, Queen of, see Libussa
Bois le Comte, 577
Boitzenburg, see Arnim
Bombelles, 552
Bonaparte, see Napoleon, Charles Lucien, etc.
Borgo, see Pozzo di Borgo
Börne, 121, 122, 125, 185
Bornemann, 412

Börnstein, 306
Borsig, 294
Bosch, see Kemper
Bose, 92, 93
Bötticher, 241, 466
Boyen, 239, 241, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 422, 469, 544
Bramante, 169
Brandenburg, 311
Brandenburg, Elector of, see Frederick William
Brassier de Saint-Simon-Ballade, 326, 327, 330
Braun, 32, 85
Braunfels, see Solms-Braunfels
Brunswick, Duke of, see William
Bray, 330, 478
Brentano, Clemens, 43
Brentano, Lorenz, 512
Bresson, 132, 545, 596, 597
Broglie, 572, 577
Brüggemann, 31
Brühl, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 592, 593, 594, 595
Brunnow, 317, 319, 320, 321, 328, 329, 356, 357
Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel, Duke of, see Henry the Younger
Buch, 6, 25, 595
Büchsel, 99
Bülow, Baron Heinrich, 6, 20, 113, 217, 218, 226, 229, 230, 237, 239, 240, 241, 242, 265, 266, 344
Bülow, Hans (count, councillor to legation), 370, 397
Bülow-Cummerow, 289, 290
Bulwer, 544, 545
Bunsen, 7, 25, 26, 36, 106, 107, 209, 213, 218, 226, 229, 230, 232, 233, 234, 250, 258, 259, 262, 263, 266, 272, 273, 280, 317, 318, 322, 325, 326, 329, 355, 357, 358, 359, 390, 467, 530, 531, 548, 549, 550, 560, 561, 564, 566, 575, 577, 578, 581, 587, 588, 598
Buol, 562
Bürck, see Baier-Burck
Burckhardt, 574
Buss, 510
Buttlar, 89
Byron, 131

C.

Cabet, 303, 305
Cadiz, Duke of, see Francis
Cæsar, Caius Julius, 255
Caffarelli, 25, 26
Cake Arnim, see Arnim, Heinrich Friedrich
Campe, 486, 596
Camphausen, 308, 413, 448, 449, 471
Cancrin, 237, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 277
Canino, Prince of, see Charles Lucien, etc.
Canitz, 91, 93, 212, 218, 226, 233, 235, 244, 250, 251, 253, 265, 266, 281, 319, 326, 330, 331, 333, 336, 339, 343, 344, 345, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 356, 358, 359, 360, 361, 392, 393, 394, 397, 398, 406, 418, 459, 460, 476, 480, 484, 485, 491, 498, 500, 508, 531, 532, 533, 549, 553, 565, 566, 575, 580, 581, 583, 584, 585, 587, 589, 605
Canning, George, 256, 550, 566
Canning, Stratford, see Stratford de Redcliffe
Cantagrel, 486
Capaccini, 8, 9, 12, 13, 16, 17, 27, 594
Carl Ivanovitch (Nicholas I), 238
Carlos, Don, de Bourbon, 322, 461, 542
Carlyle, Thomas (historian and essayist), 310
Carlyle, Thomas (Irvingite), 104
Carnot, 406
Caroline, Queen of Bavaria, 47, 48
Caroline Amelia, Princess of Schleswig-Holstein-Sonderburg-Augustenburg (subsequently Queen of Denmark), 379, 384
Caroline Augusta, Empress of Austria, 44, 551
Carolsfeld, see Schnorr
Cassel, see Hesse-Cassel
Catiline, 476
Catiline, the Bavarian, see Rohmer
Cavour, 222, 254
Chambord, Duke of, see Henry
Chambrier, Alexandre, 582, 583, 590
Chambrier, Frédéric, 543
Chamisso, 127, 139
Charlemagne, 134, 158
Charles, Crown Prince of Würtemberg, 506
Charles, Duke of Glücksburg, 382
Charles X, King of France, 42
Charles V, King of Spain, see Carlos, Don
Charles, Prince of Prussia, 435
Charles Albert, King of Piedmont and Sardinia, 11, 565, 568, 569, 576
Charles Frederick, Grand Duke of Saxe-Weimar, 502
Charles Louis Napoleon Bonaparte (afterwards Napoleon III), see Napoleon, Charles Louis
Charles Lucien Jules Laurent Bonaparte, Prince of Canino, 374
Charles (III) Philip, Elector of the Palatinate, 50
Charles Theodore, Elector of the Palatinate, 478
Chartres, Duke of, see Ferdinand Philippe, etc.
Chasseloup-Laubat, 369

Chotek, 251
Christian II, King of Denmark and Norway, Duke of Schleswig-Holstein, 373
Christian VII, King of Denmark and Norway, Duke of Schleswig-Holstein, 378, 389
Christian VIII, King of Denmark, Duke of Schleswig-Holstein and Lauenburg, 286, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 388, 390, 391, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 602
Christian, Prince of Schleswig-Holstein-Sonderburg-Augustenburg, 384, 385
Christian, Prince of Schleswig-Holstein-Sonderburg-Glücksburg (later Christian IX, King of Denmark), 384
Christian Charles Frederick Augustus, Duke of Schleswig-Holstein-Sonderburg-Augustenburg, 370, 371, 379, 380, 381, 383, 384, 387, 391, 397, 602
Christina, see Maria Christina
Ciceruacchio, 560
Clausen, 373, 396
Cobden, 227, 255, 256, 259, 260, 262
Coburg, see Saxe-Coburg
Cochläus, 225
Coethen, see Anhalt-Coethen
Collenbach, Rüdt von, 507
Collin, 341
Colloredo, 588
Comte, Bois le, 577
Consalvi, 593
Conscience, 154
Considérant, 486
Constant, 305, 414
Cornelius, 31, 43, 153, 155, 156, 158, 159, 445, 563
Cosmopolitan Nightwatchman, see Dingelstedt
Cotta, 223, 224, 248, 520, 562
Courvoisier, 590
Crelinger, 366
Crémieux, 298
Criminil, see Reventlow-Criminil
Cromwell, 171, 267
Cummerow, see Bülow-Cummerow
Curtius, 136
Czartoryski, 336, 340
Czerski, 79, 81, 89, 94

D.

d' and de (names beginning thus are indexed without prefix)
DAHLMANN, 83, 152, 169, 170, 171, 172, 179, 180, 181, 310, 376, 385, 441, 511, 522, 524
Dalmatie, 336, 356
Dampfboot, see *Westphalische Dampfboot*
Dankwart, 381
Danneskjold-Samsö, 385
Danton, 499
Dante, 559
Darmstadt, see Hesse-Darmstadt
de (names beginning thus are indexed without prefix)
Deak, 556
Decazes, 388
Deffner, 223
Degenfeld, 484
Deger, 160
Deines, 497
Delaroche, 154
Delessart, 305
Demeter, 74
Denmark, Hereditary Prince of, see Frederick Ferdinand
Denmark, King of, see Christian II, Christian VII, Christian VIII, Frederick IV, Frederick VI, Frederick VII, Waldemar IV
Denmark, Princess of, see Louisa Augusta, Louisa Charlotte
Denmark, Queen of, see Caroline Amelia, Louisa
Dessau, see Anhalt-Dessau
Dessauer, see Leopold I, Prince of Anhalt-Dessau
Detroit, 104
Deutinger, 481
Deutsche Jahrbücher, 176
Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift, 223, 277
Deutsche Zeitung, 524, 525, 526
Deutsche Zuschauer, 512
Devrient, Eduard, 149
Devrient, Emil, 149
Devrient, Wilhelmine, see Schröder-Devrient,
Deycks, 364, 365
Dieffenbach, 199, 597
Diepenbrock, 13, 30, 33, 34, 35, 43, 46, 79, 315, 469, 476
Dieringer, 34
Dieskau, 85
Dingelstedt, 126, 127, 128, 152
Dirckinck-Holmfeld, 272, 385
Disraeli, 257, 359
Dittmer, see Thon-Dittmer
Dohna, 99, 408
Dohna-Lauck, 470
Döleke, 304
Dolffs, see Bockum-Dolffs
Döllinger, 58, 63, 481
Donats, 574
Dönhoff, 42, 44, 45, 47, 49, 51, 52, 59, 77, 360, 361, 362, 393, 482, 497, 518, 519, 520, 526, 534, 535
Dorner, 118
Dove, 197

Dowiat, 82
Dräseke, 96, 97, 102
Dreyse, 401
Droste-Hülshoff, 144, 145
Droste-Vischering, Caspar Max, 33
Droste-Vischering, Clemens August, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 26, 27, 28, 29, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42, 78, 391, 593, 594
Droysen, 171, 172, 385, 522, 600
Droz, 171
Druey, 574
du (names beginning thus are indexed without prefix)
Duckwitz, 266, 267, 268, 269
Duesberg, 30, 292
Dufour, 574, 578, 579, 585
Dulon, 109
Dumoulin, 207
Duncker (director of police in Berlin), 364
Duncker, Max (historian), 103, 416, 426
Duncombe, 355
Dungern, 516
Dunin, 5, 6, 7, 26, 31, 32, 337
Dürer, 54, 158, 162
Dusch, 509
Dyhrn, 311, 463
Dzialynski, 337, 341

E.

Ebbesen, 372
Eberhard, 46
Eichhorn, Carl Friedrich, 392, 409
Eichhorn, Johann Albert Friedrich, 11, 15, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 32, 33, 45, 92, 95, 97, 100, 103, 104, 105, 108, 109, 111, 112, 113, 115, 116, 120, 174, 201, 222, 275, 276, 314, 347, 400, 455, 593
Eichmann, 466
Eicke, von Repgow, 536
Eilers, 51
Einert, 536
Eiselen, 220
Eisenmann, 483
Elchi, The Great, see Stratford de Redcliffe
Elector, The Great, see Frederick William
Elizabeth, Grand Duchess of Russia (later Duchess of Nassau), 515
Elizabeth, Queen of Prussia, 484
Emilius, Prince of Hesse-Darmstadt, 515, 517, 612, 613, 614, 615
Engels, 307, 308
England, Queen of, see Victoria
England, King of, see Henry VII
Ense, see Rahel, Varnhagen
Eötvös, 556
Erasmus, 174
Erdmann, 486
Erler, 103
Ernest IV (II), Duke of Saxe-Coburg and Gotha, 503, 528, 544, 545, 546
Ernest Augustus, King of Hanover, 127, 210, 211, 213, 215, 218, 281, 343, 387, 441, 459, 499, 500, 501
Espartero, 544
Este, see Austria-Este
Evangelische Kirchenzeitung, 99, 116
Evald, see Ewald
Ewald, 395
Ewerbeck, 305
Ewers, 389, 390
Eylert, 102

F.

Faber, see Zimmermann
Fädrelandet, 373
Falck, 376, 385, 398
Falcke, 501
Falcon of the Vistula, see Benedek
Falkenstein, 88, 89, 92
Falkson, 80, 106, 107
Fallenstein, 525
Fallersleben, see Hoffmann
Fallmerayer, 334, 335, 488
Farel, 583
Fein, 303
Ferdinand, Archduke of Austria, 338
Ferdinand, Duke of Anhalt-Coethen, 217
Ferdinand I, Emperor of Austria, 343, 344, 350, 497, 557
Ferdinand II, Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, 554
Ferdinand V, the Catholic, King of Arragon, 541
Ferdinand Philippe Joseph Louis Charles Henry, Duke of Chartres, subsequently Duke of Orleans, 316
Ferraris, Zichy, see Metternich, Melanie
Ferretti, see Pius IX
Feuerbach, 189, 304
Fichte, 169
Fickler, 69, 82
Ficquelmont, 319, 344, 568
Firebrand, Lord, see Palmerston
Fischer, 278
Flahault, 319
Flor, 385
Flottwell, 249, 281, 282, 283, 289, 291, 310, 450
Fonton, 241
Forster, 194
Förster, 22
Forstner, 406, 470
Fouqué, 123
France, King of, see Charles X, Henry Duke of Chambord, Louis XVI

Francis, Emperor of Austria, 614
Francis of Assisi, Duke of Cadiz (later titular king of Spain), 545, 546, 547
Francis Joseph, Archduke of Austria, 552
Frederick, Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel, 370, 371
Frederick I, Barbarossa, Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, 363
Frederick IV, King of Denmark and Norway, Duke of Schleswig-Holstein, 382
Frederick VI, King of Denmark (and Norway), Duke of Schleswig-Holstein and Lauenburg, 367, 601
Frederick VII, King of Denmark, Duke of Schleswig-Holstein and Lauenburg (crown prince afterwards king) 367, 369, 394, 396, 397, 398, 399
Frederick II, the Great, King of Prussia, 104, 135, 137, 140, 146, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 174, 433, 453, 467, 530, 532, 539, 591
Frederick, Prince of Baden, 508
Frederick, Prince of Schleswig-Holstein-Sonderburg-Augustenburg, 384, 385
Frederick, Augustus II, King of Saxony, 495, 502
Frederick Christian the Younger, Duke of Schleswig-Holstein-Sonderburg-Augustenburg, 378, 379, 600, 601
Frederick Emilius Augustus, Prince of Noer, 371, 379, 380, 382, 397, 602
Frederick Ferdinand, Hereditary Prince of Denmark, 369
Frederick William, Elector of Brandenburg (Great Elector), 165, 271, 401, 403, 421, 607
Frederick William, Electoral Prince of Hesse-Cassel (later Frederick William I, Elector of Hesse-Cassel), 285, 451, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499
Frederick William I, King of Prussia, 147, 177
Frederick William II, King of Prussia, 363
Frederick William III, King of Prussia, 6, 14, 15, 17, 20, 21, 23, 26, 28, 30, 47, 95, 166, 201, 270, 294, 320, 326, 365, 367, 403, 406, 414, 415, 419, 431, 434, 436, 461, 469, 491, 538, 540, 581, 584, 603, 604, 610, 614
Frederick William IV, King of Prussia, 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37, 45, 50, 56, 94, 95, 96, 97, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 114, 115, 116, 118, 119, 120, 139, 157, 165, 166, 168, 169, 172, 173, 174, 177, 194, 201, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 215, 217, 226, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 236, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 247, 248, 249, 250, 263, 264, 266, 267, 271, 276, 278, 279, 281, 282, 283, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 299, 306, 312, 313, 315, 317, 320, 326, 327, 330, 337, 339, 341, 343, 344, 348, 350, 351, 357, 358, 359, 363, 366, 367, 368, 369, 386, 390, 391, 392, 398, 400, 401, 404, 408, 409, 411, 412, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 423, 424, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 444, 445, 446, 447, 449, 455, 456, 458, 459, 460, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 473, 474, 484, 492, 493, 497, 498, 500, 501, 506, 509, 513, 514, 519, 520, 524, 525, 526, 528, 530, 531, 532, 535, 537, 538, 539, 540, 542, 549, 559, 560, 563, 564, 566, 568, 572, 577, 578, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 598, 599, 600, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 609, 610, 611
Frederick (William), Prince of Prussia (subsequently King of Prussia and German Emperor), 422, 463, 609
Freiligrath, 90, 128, 129, 130, 141, 144, 272, 309, 580
Freimütige, 408
French, Emperor of the, see Napoleon I
French, King of the, see Louis Philippe
Freytag, 151, 152, 311
Friedberg E., 592
Friedberg H., 412
Fritz, Old, see Frederick II
Froebel, 82
Furrer, 574
Fürstenberg-Stammheim, 9, 17

G.

GAGERN, Friedrich, 416
Gagern, Heinrich, 517, 518, 523
Galen, 285, 491, 496, 497, 498
Gallait, 154
Gans, 121
Gasser, 36
Gebsattel, 63
Geffcken, 267
Geibel, 136, 137, 152, 386, 387
Geissel, 16, 17, 18, 19, 27, 28, 29, 32, 33, 34, 35, 45
Genelli, 160, 161

Gentz, 180
George, Crown Prince of Hanover, 127, 500, 501
George of Podiebrad, King of Bohemia, 554
Gerhard the Great, Count of Holstein, 372
German Emperor, see Frederick (William), William, Prince of Prussia
George, Grand Duke of Mecklenburg-Strelitz, 501
Georgi, 518
Gerlach, Ernst Ludwig, 108
Gerlach, Leopold, 265, 370, 397, 398, 399, 430, 498, 537, 581
Gerland, 496
Gervinus, 82, 83, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 386, 428, 524, 525
Gesellschaftsspiegel, 308
Gesenius, 97
Gfrörer, 56
Giech, 51, 57
Gildemeister, 78, 493
Gioberti, 559, 562
Gise, 45, 64, 330, 519
Giusti, 559, 568, 569
Gladstone, 267
Glassbrenner, 135, 136, 149
Glücksburg, see Schleswig-Holstein-Sonderburg-Glücksburg
Glücksburg, Duke of, see Charles
Gneisenau, 5, 271
Goethe, 127, 131, 139, 151, 160, 181, 182, 184, 185, 190, 194, 196, 467
Göler, 73
Goltz, 98, 470
Goltzheim, see Stach
Görres, Guido, 11
Görres, Jacob Joseph, 13, 37, 42, 43, 77, 481, 498, 516
Göschel, 97
Gossner, 120
Gotha, see Saxe-Coburg and Gotha
Gottschalck, 248
Götz, see Berlichingen
Great Elchi, see Stratford de Redcliffe
Great Elector, see Frederick William
Greece, King of, see Otho
Greece, Queen of, see Amelia
Gregory XVI, Pope, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 19, 21, 22, 24, 25, 44, 48, 78, 560, 594
Grenzbote, 552
Griesheim, 402
Grimm, 141, 152, 181, 185, 186, 187, 193, 428, 522
Gröben, Carl Josef, 9, 271
Gröben, Otto Friedrich, 271
Grolman, 407
Grossmann, 55
Grubitz, 115
Grün, Anastasius, 124, 127
Grün, Carl, 308
Grüneisen, 113
Grünne, 552
Guericke, 99
Guizot, 132, 171, 232, 233, 234, 305, 306, 318, 319, 330, 355, 356, 388, 431, 545, 547, 548, 550, 565, 566, 569, 572, 575, 576, 577, 580, 581, 589, 596, 598
Guldberg, see Hoegh-Guldberg
Gülich, 383
Gumppenberg, 52, 64, 478, 479
Gustavus, Prince of Vasa, 72
Gutzkow, 145, 147, 148

H.

Haber, Moritz, 72, 73
Haber, Salomon, 72, 233, 513
Hahn-Hahn, Carl Friedrich, 143
Hahn-Hahn, Ida, 143, 144, 427
Hähnel, 169
Hahnemann, 199
Haller, 40, 179, 277, 429, 572
Halm, 149
Hälschner, 386
Halske, 287
Hampden, 171
Hamburger Korrespondent, 215
Hanka, 554
Hänlein, 491
Hanover, Crown Prince of, see George
Hanover, King of, see Ernest Augustus
Hansemann, 438, 440, 444, 461, 465, 523, 530
Hardenberg, 11, 36, 201, 226, 227, 245, 293, 297, 300, 302, 414, 415, 442, 449, 462, 614
Häring, see Alexis
Harkort, Caspar, 294
Harkort, Friedrich Wilhelm, 227, 268, 281, 292, 467
Harless, 57, 58
Harring, 304
Haselberg, 416
Hasenclever, 160
Hass, 131
Harlicek, 554
Hassenpflug, 204, 493
Hatzfeldt, 35, 348, 588, 589
Hebbel, 150, 151
Hebel, 94, 142
Hecker, 512, 513
Heekeren, 209
Heffter, 409
Hegel, 157
Hegewisch, Dietrich Hermann, 379
Hegewisch, Franz Hermann, 286, 380, 602
Heine, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 158, 306, 312, 336, 595, 596, 597, 598
Heinse, 486

Heinzen, 306, 469
Heller, 524
Helmholtz, 198
Helwing, 386
Hengstenberg, 55, 99, 102, 104, 110, 114, 116, 120
Hennenhofer, 510
Hennig, 426
Henning, 415
Henry, Duke of Chambord (termed Henry V, King of France), 322
Henry, Duke of Seville, 545, 546
Henry VII, King of England, 541
Henry, Prince of Prussia, 5, 11, 14
Henry LXXII, Prince of Reuss, 87, 88
Henry the Younger, Duke of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel, 225
Herder, 196
Hergenhahn, 523
Hermann, Gottfried, 188
Hermes, 515
Herostratus, 137
Herrmann, Emil, 119
Herwegh, 124, 126, 129, 137
Hess, 304, 306, 308
Hesse-Cassel, Elector of, see Frederick William, William II
Hesse-Cassel, Electoral Prince of, see Frederick William
Hesse-Cassel, Electress of, see, Augusta
Hesse-Cassel, Landgrave of, see Frederick William
Hesse-Cassel, Landgravine of, see Alexandra Louisa Charlotte
Hesse-Cassel, Prince Regent of, see Frederick William, Electoral Prince
Hesse-Cassel, Princess of, see Louisa
Hesse-Darmstadt, Grand Duke of, see Louis I, Louis II
Hesse-Darmstadt, Prince of, see Emilius
Hesse-Darmstadt, Princess of, see Maria Alexandrovna
Hesse-Homburg, Princess of, see Mary Ann
Heubner, 101
Hinrichs, 103
Hirscher, 65
Hirzel, 187
Historisch-politische Blätter für das Katholische Deutschland, 43
Hochberg, 352
Hock, 352
Hoegh-Guldberg, 367
Hoffmann, August Heinrich (of Fallersleben), 71, 126
Hoffmann, E. E., 201
Hoffmann, Johann Gottfried, 297
Hoffmann and Campe, 486, 597
Hoffstätter, 41
Höfler, 43, 63, 481
Höfling, 57
Holbein, 158, 417
Hollweg, see Bethmann-Hollweg
Holmfeld, see Dirckinck-Holmfeld
Holstein, see Schleswig-Holstein
Holstein, Count of, see Gerhard the Great
Holtzendorff, 469
Holy Roman Empire, Emperor of, see Ferdinand II, Frederick I, Barbarossa, Joseph II
Homburg, see Hesse-Homburg
Homer, 137
Homeyer, 409
Hörmann, 480
Hormayr, 488
Horn, 289
Horst, 215
Hübner, Carl, 312
Hübner, Josef Alexander, 90, 91, 93
Hülshoff, 144
Humboldt, Alexander, 105, 176, 194, 195, 196, 197, 452, 597,
Humboldt, Wilhelm, 228, 255
Hungary, King of, see Ferdinand I
Hurter, 40, 44, 572
Hüsgen, 14
Hutten, 54, 81, 125, 129, 131, 183
Hvidt, 396

I.

Immermann, 142, 146, 184
Iron Duke, see Wellington
Isabella II, Queen of Spain, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548,
Itzstein, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 513, 523
Iven, 15, 33

J.

Jacoby, 80, 99, 106, 366, 408, 413, 414, 415, 416, 433, 449, 511, 580
Jagetzow, see Rodbertus
Jahrbücher, see *Deutsche Jahrbücher*
Jaraczewski, 455
Jarcke, 11, 44, 508, 516
Jaup, 516
Jeremy Bentham, see Bentham
Joan of Arc, 393
John, Archduke of Austria, 560, 575
John, Prince of Saxony (later King of Saxony), 86, 89, 90, 92, 467
Jolly, 509
Jordan, Johann Ludwig, 84, 86, 93
Jordan, Sylvester, 494, 495, 509
Jordan, Wilhelm, 92, 309
Joseph, 85
Joseph, Archduke of Austria, 557
Joseph II, Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, 532
Jude, Der, 453
Julia, Duchess of Anhalt-Coethen, 12

Julian, Roman Emperor, 173
Julius II, Pope, 561

K.

Kalergis, 327
Kalisch, 149
Kamptz, Carl Christoph Albert Heinrich (the demagogue hunter), 352, 386, 411, 415, 501
Kamptz (councillor to legation, nephew of above), 352, 353
Kant, 198, 219
Katakazi, 324, 327
Katholik, 27, 33
Kaulbach, 156, 157, 158
Keller, 76, 77
Kellermann, 13
Kemper, 206
Kern, 574
Ketteler, 10, 22
Kieler Korrespondenzblatt, 376
Kielmansegge, 213
Killisch von Horn, 289
Kimsky, 11
Kirchenpauer, 267
Kirchenzeitung, see *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*
Kiss, 467
Klefekir, 215
Kleist, 363
Klüber, 508
Knäs of Russia (Frederick William IV), 306
Knauer, 25, 34
Knyphausen, 343, 435, 441, 454, 459, 500, 585, 586
Koch (judge), 365
Koch, Josef Anton, 161
Kollettis, 330, 331
Kohary, see Saxe-Coburg-Gotha-Kohary
Kollar, 554
Kolnische Zeitung, 93, 433, 434, 471, 505
Kolowrat, 551
Könneritz, 85, 88
Körner, 123
Korrespondent, see *Hamburger Korrespondent.*
Korrespondenzblatt, see *Kieler Korrespondenzblatt*
Korsch, 80
Kossuth, 556, 557
Krafft, 57
Krasinski, 336, 596
Kraus, 435
Krause, 102
Kreuzzeitung, 525
Krieg, 74
Krüger, 164
Kruse, 524
Kübeck, 252
Kuefstein, 361
Kuenzer, 65
Kugler, 164, 182
Kuhlmann, 304
Kühne, 201, 226, 230, 231, 232, 243, 246, 248, 249, 250, 264, 266, 290, 291, 315, 429, 430, 448, 465, 525, 610, 612
Küster, 60, 244, 248, 327, 328

L.

Lachmann, 187, 188
Ladenberg, 11
Lamartine, 238, 309, 399
Lambruschini, 6, 7, 8, 13, 15, 16, 18, 21, 24, 25, 561, 592, 593
Lamennais, 303
Lancizolle, 392, 415
Landfermann, 118
Landsfeld, see Montez
Landtagzeitung, 70
Langen, 92
Lansquenet, the, see Schwarzenberg
Lasaulx, 480, 481
Lassberg, 144
Laubat, see Chasseloup-Laubat
Laube, 145, 146, 148
Lauck, see Dohna-Lauck
Lauenburg, Duke of, see Christian VIII Frederick VI; Frederick VII
Laurens, 11
Lehmann (Frederick William IV), 239
Lehmann, Orla, 372, 373, 374
Lehmus, 57
Leiningen, 276, 475, 527, 528
Lenau, 130
Lentze, 443, 446
Leo, 415
Leopold, Grand Duke of Baden, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 72, 73, 74, 508, 510, 511
Leopold I, King of the Belgians, 218, 232, 233, 234, 235, 317, 322, 542, 546
Leopold I, Prince of Anhalt-Dessau (the Old Dessauer), 401
Leopold, Prince of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha-Kohary, 542, 544, 545, 546
Lerchenfeld (baron), 61
Lerchenfeld (count), 484
Lessing, Carl Friedrich, 160, 161
Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim, 139, 168, 183, 452
Len, 573
Lewald, Fanny, 143, 427
Lewald (lawyer), 365, 366
Libelt, 365
Libussa, Queen of Bohemia, 554
Lich, see Solms-Lich
Lichnowsky, 42, 123, 439, 440, 461, 463, 468
Liebermann, 233, 241, 242, 243, 317, 320, 322, 324, 325, 328, 339, 340

Liebig, 196, 197
Linde, 515, 516, 517,
Lindenau, 84, 85
Linder, 43
List, 87, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 230, 231, 235, 236, 250, 251, 254, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 266, 269, 598, 600
Loe, 516
Lohbauer, 524
Lola Montez, see Montez
Lorentzen, 384
Lornsen, 376
Lottum, 6, 209
Louis, Archduke of Austria, 252, 551, 552, 557
Louis I, Grand Duke of Hesse-Darmstadt, 613
Louis II, Grand Duke of Hesse-Darmstadt, 515, 516, 517
Louis, Hereditary Prince of Baden, 508
Louis I, King of Bavaria, 15, 16, 18, 39, 45, 46, 47, 48, 50, 51, 53, 54, 56, 59, 60, 61, 62, 64, 65, 67, 122, 135, 155, 158, 159, 236, 244, 287, 326, 327, 328, 335, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 490, 491, 519, 612, 613
Louis XVI, King of France, 530
Louis Charles Philippe Raphael of Orleans, Duke of Nemours, 316
Louis Napoleon, see Napoleon Charles Louis, Napoleon Louis
Louis Philippe, King of the French, 132, 316, 323, 348, 356, 388, 417, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 549, 564, 565, 577, 588, 589
Louis Philippe Albert of Orleans, Count of Paris, 316
Louis William Augustus, Grand Duke of Baden, 510
Louisa, Princess of Hesse-Cassel (later Princess of Schleswig-Holstein-Sonderburg-Glücksburg, and subsequently Queen of Denmark), 384
Louisa Augusta, Princess of Denmark and Duchess of Schleswig-Holstein-Sonderburg-Augustenburg, 378
Louisa Charlotte, Princess of Denmark and Landgravine of Hesse-Cassel, 370, 384
Löwenstern, 394
Lücke, 120
Ludwigel, see Louis I, King of Bavaria
Luitpold, Prince of Bavaria, 60, 328, 330
Lüning, 308, 411
Luther, 38, 46, 53, 63, 78, 81, 82, 108, 125, 131, 174, 175, 176, 225
Lützow, 12, 562
Luxemburg, Grand Duke of, see William I, William II
Lynar, 463
Lyons, 324, 325, 327, 331

M.

Machiavelli, 188, 541, 559
Mack, 76
McLane, 273
Madvig, 373
Magdeburgische Zeitung, 93
Magnus, 192
Maid of Orleans, 393
Mainzer Katholik, see *Katholik*
Malet, 250
Malzan, 208
Man, 269
Marat, see Sander
Marggraff, 524
Marheineke, 38, 103, 120
Maria Alexandrovna, Princess of Hesse-Darmstadt (later Empress of Russia), 515
Maria II, da Gloria, Queen of Portugal, 550
Maria Christina, Queen of Spain, 544, 545, 546
Maria Louisa Ferdinanda, Infanta of Spain (later Duchess of Montpensier), 543, 546, 547
Maria Pavlovna, Grand Duchess of Saxe-Weimar, 502
Marr, 304
Marrast, 486
Martin (nun), 6, 7
Martin (professor), 34
Martin, Theodore, 544
Marwitz, 415
Mary Anne, Princess of Hesse-Homburg and wife of Prince William the Elder, 271
Marx, 306, 307, 308
Mathis, 313
Mathy, 69, 70, 72, 73, 82, 141, 510, 511, 512, 513, 523, 524, 538
Mayer, 198
Maucler, 505
Maurer, 40, 60, 361, 482, 483, 484, 485, 487
Max, Archduke of Austria-Este, 516
Maximilian, Crown Prince of Bavaria (subsequently Maximilian II, King of Bavaria), 60, 62, 323
Maximilian I, Elector of Bavaria, 40, 45, 54, 56
Maximilian I, Joseph, King of Bavaria (Max Joseph), 478
Maximilian, Margrave of Baden, 72
Mazzini, 304, 558, 562, 568
Mecklenburg-Strelitz, Grand Duke of, see George
Medem, 343, 349
Meiningen, see Saxe-Meiningen
Meissner, 309

Mejer, 113
Melanchthon, 53, 57
Mendelssohn, Georg Benjamin, 415
Mendelssohn, Josef, 283
Mendelssohn, Moses, 452, 453
Menzel, Adolf, 163, 164, 165, 166, 177
Menzel, Wolfgang, 506
Merckel (lord lieutenant), 25, 245, 246, 311, 313
Merckel, W. (councillor), 414
Merkur, see *Rheinische Merkur*
Mérode, 42
Metternich, 44, 71, 84, 90, 93, 217, 226, 233, 250, 251, 252, 253, 265, 317, 319, 320, 326, 333, 338, 339, 343, 344, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 355, 357, 359, 360, 361, 362, 364, 390, 392, 416, 417, 418, 431, 433, 458, 493, 497, 498, 521, 526, 532, 533, 534, 538, 542, 543, 549, 551, 552, 553, 555, 557, 558, 560, 561, 562, 563, 565, 566, 567, 569, 572, 575, 576, 581, 582, 584, 614
Metternich, Melanie, 555
Meuron, 582
Meusebach, 277
Mevissen, 439, 465, 523
Meyendorff, 345, 351
Meyer, 572, 573, 575
Michael Obrenovitch, Hereditary Prince of Serbia, 332
Michelangelo, 155
Michelet, 104
Mickiewicz, 336, 596
Mieroslawski, 338, 340, 364, 365, 366
Mignet, 170
Milde, 451
Mill, 255
Minckwitz, 84, 93
Minto, 566, 567, 577
Minutoli, 311
Mirabeau, 171, 440
Mohl, Moritz, 247
Mohl, Robert, 505
Möhler, 43, 58, 76
Moliere, 11
Moltke, Carl, 382, 394, 395
Moltke, Helmuth, 277, 322
Mone, 66, 74
Monnard, 588
Monrad, 373
Montalembert, 42
Montemolin, 542
Montez, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 482, 483, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 504
Montgelas, 47
Montpensier, Duchess of, see Maria Louisa Ferdinanda
Montpensier, Duke of, see Antoine Marie, etc.
Morse, 287
Möser, Justus, 430
Moser, J. J., 505
Motz, 294, 314
Moy, 41, 42, 49, 481
Müffling, 314, 407
Mühler, 27, 410
Müllensiefen, 23
Müller, Adam, 179
Müller (cabinet councillor), 240
Müller, Carl Otfried, 331
Müller, Hermann, 15
Müller, Johannes, 53, 197
Müller, Julius, 118
Müller, Siegwart, 573
Münch-Bellinghausen, 352, 353, 361, 362, 393, 521, 526, 527, 534, 535
Münchener Zeitung, 43
Munzinger, 574
Muralt, 582
Murschel, 507
Musset, 316

N.

Naff, 574
Napoleon I, 154, 182, 255, 358, 379, 469, 515, 548, 612, 613
Napoleon, Charles Louis (afterwards Napoleon III), 560
Napoleon, Louis (son of Louis Napoleon, King of Holland, 560
Nassau, Duchess of, see Elizabeth
Nassau, Duke of, see Adolphus
Nauwerk, 414
Nebenius, 66, 247, 283, 507, 509, 511
Neander, 265
Nemours, Duke of, see Louis Charles Philippe Raphael of Orleans
Nesselrode, 233, 238, 241, 243, 317, 322, 324, 327, 329, 330, 331, 333, 345, 351, 359, 389, 390, 548
Netherlands, King of, see William I, William II
Neuchâtel, Prince of, see Frederick William IV
Neuffer, 250
Nicholas I, Czar of Russia, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 285, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 339, 343, 351, 370, 371, 389, 390, 411, 420, 484, 506, 515, 548, 574, 575, 590
Nicolai, 102, 134, 452
Niebuhr, Barthold Georg, 21, 83 171, 188, 189, 222, 310, 560, 593
Niebuhr, Marcus, 560
Niegolewski, 341, 365
Niembsch von Strehlenau, see Lenau
Night-watchman, see Dingelstedt
Nitzsch, 3, 23, 78, 116, 117, 118, 120
Noer, Prince of, see Frederick Emilius Augustus
Nordenflycht, 426

Norway, King of, see Christian II, Christian VII, Frederick IV, Frederick VI, Oscar I
Nostitz-Wallwitz, 502
Nothomb, 234, 235

O.

OBERCAMP, 519
Ochsenbein, 573, 575, 576, 577, 578, 585, 590
Oersted, 375
Oesterreichische Beobachter, 253
Oetker, 494
Oettingen-Wallerstein, 52, 53, 62, 328, 475, 488, 490
Old Dessauer, The, see Leopold I, Prince of Anhalt-Dessau
Oldenburg, Grand Duke of, see Augustus (Paul Frederick)
Oldenburg, Princess of, see Amelia
Olga, Grand Duchess of Russia (later Crown Princess of Würtemberg), 320, 323, 330, 506, 551
Olshausen, 376, 384
Orleans, Duke of, see Ferdinand Philippe, etc.
Orleans, Maid of, 393
Orleans, The, see Louis Philippe
Orloff, 238, 320, 337
Oscar I, King of Sweden and Norway, 372
Oppenheim, 297
Osten, Prokesch von, see Prokesch-Osten
Ostrogoths, King of the, see Theodatus
Otho, King of Greece, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330
Otterstedt, 71, 74
Otto, 96
Oxenstierna, 601

P.

PALACKY, 554
Palatinate, Elector of the, see Charles (III), Philip, Charles Theodore
Palladio, 188
Palmerston, 6, 203, 259, 263, 318, 324, 325, 329, 330, 331, 356, 357, 529, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 564, 565, 566, 567, 575, 577, 578, 579, 580, 587
Palsgrave, see Charles (III) Philip
Paris, Count of, see Louis Philippe Albert of Orleans
Paskiewitch, 340, 354
Patow, 243, 244, 250, 267, 353
Paulsen, 385
Paulus, 59, 82, 451
Pechlin, 381, 393
Peel, Robert (cotton spinner), 257, 259
Peel, Robert (statesman), 244, 257, 258, 259, 261, 263, 272, 322, 323, 332, 578
Pelz, 312
Pericles, 167
Pernice, 92
Perthes, 100, 355
Pertz, 522
Pescatore, 208
Peter, Bishop, see Richarz
Peter the Great, Czar of Russia, 237
Petitti, 254, 562
Pfuel, 583, 586
Philip V, King of Spain, 543
Philippsberg, 498
Phillips, 41, 481, 516
Piedmont, King of, see Charles Albert
Pilsach, see Senfft-Pilsach
Pinder, 352
Piscatori, 325, 327
Pitt, 257
Pius VIII, Pope, 593
Pius IX, Pope, 32, 484, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 577, 579
Platen, Adolf, 387, 394, 454, 466
Platen, August (poet), 126, 127, 136, 147
Plettenberg, see Bodelschwingh-Plettenberg
Podiebrad, see George of Podiebrad
Poland, King of, see Augustus II the Strong
Polignac, 42
Ponsonby, 333, 357
Popes of Rome, see Alexander III, Gregory XVI, Julius II, Pius VIII, Pius IX
Portfolio, 334
Portugal, Queen of, see Maria II
Pourlatès, 582
Pozzo di Borgo, 238, 332
Praslin, 588
Preetz, see Reventlow-Preetz
Prela, 29, 41
Preller, 160
Preuss, 176
Preussische Allgemeine Zeitung, 217
Preussische Staatszeitung, 226, 232
Prieser, 505
Prince Consort, see Albert
Prittwitz, 314
Prince Smith, see Smith
Prokesch-Osten, 326
Proudhon, 305
Protestantismus und Kirche, see *Zeitschrift*, etc.
Prussia, King of, see Frederick II the Great, Frederick William I, Frederick William III, Frederick William IV, Frederick (William)
Prussia, Prince of, see Adalbert, Charles, Frederick (William), Henry, William (the elder), William (the younger)

Prussia, Queen of, see Elizabeth
Prutz, 71
Puchta, 409

R.

RADOWITZ, 34, 71, 73, 74, 248, 250, 361, 386, 427, 468, 507, 508, 511, 512, 513, 531, 532, 537, 538, 539, 587, 588, 589
Radetzky, 568, 569, 576
Radziwill, 31, 457
Rahel, 121
Raimund, 149
Rainer, Archduke of Austria, 568, 576
Rakoczy, 557
Rancke, 152, 174, 175, 176, 177, 183, 185, 357, 358, 549
Rasmussen, 395
Rattenkönig, the Nassau, see Dungern
Rau, 220
Rauch, Christian, 53, 156, 166, 167, 168
Rauch (military attaché in St. Petersburg), 237, 240, 241, 351, 391
Raumer, 104, 105, 176
Rayneval, 355
Rechberg, 52
Redcliffe, see Stratford de Redcliffe
Redtenbacher, 55
Regenbrecht, 79
Rehfues, 28, 138
Reimer, 187
Reichenbach (count), 433
Reichenbach (countess, wife of William II, Elector of Hesse-Cassel), 492, 497
Reisach, 10, 13, 18, 34, 41, 478, 487
Reizenstein, 66
Renard, 352
Repgow, 536
Reschid, 333
Rethel, 158, 159
Rettig, 507
Reumont, 594, 595
Reuss, Prince of, see Henry LXXII
Reventlow, Friedrich, see Reventlow-Preetz
Reventlow (Danish envoy) in London, 273
Reventlow, Heinrich, see Reventlow-Criminil
Reventlow, Joseph, see Reventlow-Criminil
Reventlow-Altenhof, 382
Reventlow-Criminil, Heinrich, 381, 398
Reventlow-Criminil, Joseph, 371, 382
Reventlow-Preetz, 380, 381, 383, 384, 396, 398
Reyher, 405
Reyscher, 521
Rhein, 485
Rheinische Merkur, 37, 489
Rheinische Zeitung, 308, 439
Ricardo, 219
Richarz, 47, 48
Richelot, 203
Richter, 161, 162, 163, 168
Riedel, 41
Riesen, 227
Riesser, 452, 453
Rietschel, 53, 156, 166, 168, 169
Ringseis, 43, 49, 481
Ritschl, 189
Ritter, Heinrich, 190
Ritter, Joseph, Ignaz, 24, 39
Röbling, 275
Rochow, Gustav Adolf Rothus, 6, 76, 112, 113, 232, 239, 330, 334, 337, 345, 347, 351, 389, 392, 393, 421
Rochow, Theodor Heinrich Rochus, 243, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 549
Rochow-Stülpe, 418, 459, 460
Rochussen, 209
Rodbertus, 292
Röder, 278
Roggenbach, 508
Rohmer, 64, 123
Röhr, 82
Rolff, 268
Römer, 506, 507, 523
Roman Emperor, see Julian, Tiberius
Ronge, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 89, 94, 95, 114
Rönne, 229, 230, 231, 235, 248, 249, 250, 263, 266, 267, 273, 282, 289
Röpell, 414
Roscher, 222
Rossi, 565, 567
Rotenhan, 57, 61
Roth, 58, 59
Rother, 278, 279, 282, 283, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 293, 294, 418
Rothschild, Anselm Mayer (Amschel), 127, 285, 293, 297, 315, 325, 451, 497, 520
Rothschild, Salomon Mayer, 552
Rotteck, 67, 79, 451, 552
Rougemont, 582
Rousseau, 170, 195
Ruchet, 582
Rückert, 53
Rüdt von Collenbach, 507
Ruge, 82, 306, 426, 596, 598
Rumohr, 367
Rupert, Provost of Scheyern, 48
Ruperti, 261
Rupp, 98, 99, 102, 106, 108, 109, 514
Russia, Czar of, see Alexander I, Nicholas I, Peter the Great
Russia, Empress of, see Alexandra Feodorocna, Maria Alexandrovna
Russia, Grand Duchess of, see Elizabeth, Olga.

S.

Sächsische Vaterlands blätter, 78, 87
Sack, 271, 300

Sagan, 122
Sailer, 54
Saint-Simon-Ballade, see Brassier
Salis-Soglio, 579
Sallet, 128
Salomon, 297
Samsö, see Danneskjold-Samso
Samwer, 376, 380, 600
Sander, 69, 223
Sarachaja, see Uria-Sarachaja
Sardinia, King of, see Charles Albert
Saucken-Tarputschen, 444
Savigny, 105, 222, 229, 363, 409, 410, 411, 412, 462, 470, 471, 472, 532, 533, 536, 605
Saxe-Coburg and Gotha, Duke of, see Ernest IV (II)
Saxe-Coburg-Gotha-Kohary, Prince of, see Leopold
Saxe-Meiningen, Duke of, see Bernard Eric Freund
Saxe-Weimar, Grand Duke of, see Charles Frederick
Saxony, Elector of, see Augustus II, the Strong
Saxony, King of, see Antony, Frederick Augustus II, John
Saxony, Prince of, see John
Say, 219
Schaaffhausen, 297
Schadow, 8, 9, 17, 160, 161, 166, 168
Schaffarik, 554
Schaffrath, 85
Schapper, 307
Schebest, Agnese, see Strauss
Scheele, 501
Scheffer, 493
Schelling, 152, 178
Schenkendorf, 123
Scherff, 207, 208
Schickler, 288, 289
Schiel, 382, 383
Schiller, 67, 147, 148, 159, 174, 184, 378, 503
Schinkel, 155, 166, 169, 467
Schlayer, 76, 505, 507
Schleiden, 367
Schleiermacher, 2, 102, 103, 116, 437
Schleinitz, 232
Schlesische Zeitung, 93
Schleswig-Holstein, Duke of, see Christian II, Christian VII, Christian VIII, Frederick IV, Frederick VI, Frederick VII
Schleswig-Holstein-Sonderburg-Augustenburg, Duchess of, see Louisa Augusta
Schleswig-Holstein-Sonderburg-Augustenburg, Duke of, see Christian Charles, etc., Frederick Christian
Schleswig-Holstein-Sonderburg-Augustenburg, Prince of, see Christian Frederick
Schleswig-Holstein-Sonderburg-Augustenburg, Princess of, see Caroline Amelia
Schleswig - Holstein - Sonderburg - Glücksburg, Princess of, see Louisa
Schlöffel, 313
Schlosser, 65, 170, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184
Schlüter, 165, 167
Schmalz, 415
Schmedding, 30, 32
Schmidt, Friedrich Wilhelm August (of Werneuchen), 139
Schmidt, Heinrich Julian, 433
Schmidt, Johann Caspar, see Stirner
Schmidt (Swabian communist), 303
Schmidt, Wilhelm Adolf, 174
Schmitthenner, 220
Schnaase, 182
Schnorr von Carolsfeld, 159, 161, 163
Schön, 172, 177, 289, 293, 303, 480, 525, 544
Schönhals, 569
Schönlein, 470
Schoultz-Ascheraden, 369, 384, 388, 391, 394, 397
Schouw, 396
Schrenck, Carl, 65, 478
Schrenck, Sebastian, 64, 65
Schröder-Devrient, 122, 149
Schulte, 292
Schulz, 103
Schwäbl, 46
Schwann, 197
Schwanthaler, 53, 67
Schwarz, 104
Schwarzenberg (jurist), 410
Schwarzenberg, Felix, 562
Schwarzenberg, Friedrich ("the Lansquenet), 123, 575, 579
Schwerin, 118, 437, 442, 448, 460
Schwind, 159
Scott, 131, 138, 139, 146
Scribe, 146
Seckendorff, 361
Sedlnitzky, Josef, 22
Sedlnitzky, Leopold, 5, 6, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 29, 39, 76, 79, 593
Seeblätter, 69
Seinsheim, 478
Sejanus, 174
Semper, 169
Sempronia, 475
Senfft-Pilsach, 43, 229, 483
Sepp, 481
Serbia, Hereditary Prince of, see Alexander Karageorgevitch, Michael Obrenovitch
Serristori, 253
Seville, Duke of, see Henry
Shakespeare, 145, 158, 260
Siemens, 287

Sieveking, 265, 274
Simon, August Heinrich (lawyer and liberal), 411, 426, 433, 511
Simon (councillor, Prussian service in Rhineland), 427
Simons, 208
Sina, 552
Sintenis, 96
Sion, 43
Skau, 375
Smidt, 265
Smith, Adam, 219, 220, 228
Smith, John Prince, 227, 228, 249, 261, 267
Snethlage, 102, 107, 108, 114
Soelen, see Verstolk van Soelen
Soglio, see Salis-Soglio
Soiron, 512, 523
Solaro, 568
Solms-Braunfels, 276, 277
Solms-Lich, 418
Somerset, 321
Sonderburg, see Schleswig-Holstein-Sonderburg-Augustenburg, and Schleswig-Holstein-Sonderburg-Glücksburg
Sophia, Archduchess of Austria, 44, 551
Sophia, Grand Duchess of Baden, 72, 73, 508
Spain, Infanta of, see Maria Louisa Ferdinanda
Spain, King of, see Carlos, Don, Francis of Assisi, Philip V
Spain, Queen of, see Isabella II, Maria Christina
Spener, 162
Spinoza, 140, 177
Staatszeitung, see *Preussische Staatszeitung*
Stach von Goltzheim, 491, 492
Stadion, 551
Stahl (bishop of Würzburg), 41, 482
Stahl, Friedrich Julius, 49, 57, 58, 117, 177, 178, 179, 180, 409, 454
Stahn, 23
Stammheim, see Fürstenberg-Stamheim
Starklof, 500
Statistica, see *Annali universali di statistica*
Stedmann, 469
Stefanski, 338
Steffens, 368
Stein, Heinrich Friedrich Carl, 51, 227, 300, 302, 430
Stein, Lorenz, 308
Stein (Silesian liberal), 433
Steinacker, 217
Steinäcker, 340
Stenzel, 177
Stephani, 59
Stephen, Archduke of Austria, 320, 551, 557
Stephens, 307
Stephenson, 255
Steiber, 313
Steiler, 475
Stirner, 189
Stöckhardt, 196
Stockmar, 529, 544
Stolberg, 36, 56, 208
Stoss, 354
Stowaski, 336, 596
Stratford de Redcliffe (Stratford Canning), 333, 334, 579
Strauss, Agnese, 173
Strauss, David Friedrich, 24, 173
Strauss, Gerhard Friedrich Abraham, 118
Strehlenau, see Lenau
Strelitz, see Mecklenburg-Strelitz
Stromeyer, 199
Struve, 512, 513
Stubenrauch, 504
Stülpe, see Rochow-Stülpe
Stüve, 442, 499, 500
Sue, 309
Svarez, 410
Sweden and Norway, King of, see Oscar I
Sybel, Heinrich, 78, 493
Sydow, 118, 577, 585
Szechenyi, 556
Szela, 342

T.

Talleyrand, 318
Tann, 62, 487
Tarputschen, see Saucken-Tarputschen
Tassaert, 166
Taxi, 520
Tengoborski, 243
Teste, 588
Tetzel, 33, 78
Thadden-Trieglaff, 117, 455, 456, 460, 461, 463
Thaer, 196
Theiner, 79, 81
Theodahad, see Theodatus
Theodatus, King of the Ostrogoths, 173
Theresa, Queen of Bavaria, 484
Thiers, 580
Thiersch, 46, 58, 489
Thil, 315, 509, 514, 515, 516, 517, 526, 527, 552
Thile, Carl Hermann, 234
Thile, Ludwig Gustav, 9, 11, 14, 15, 16, 19, 32, 94, 95, 96, 100, 101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 108, 109, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 119, 208, 209, 230, 240, 241, 247, 249, 278, 279, 281, 289, 291, 312, 322, 326, 329, 405, 407, 409, 418, 423, 427, 445, 446, 455, 460, 467, 469, 484, 549, 605
Tholuck, 99, 104

Thomasius, Christian, 96
Thomasius, Gotfried, 57
Thon-Dittmer, 61
Thorwaldsen, 374
Thudichum, 84
Thun, 361
Tiberius, Roman Emperor, 174
Tichatschek, 149
Tiedemann, 383, 387, 477
Tieck, 138, 140, 145
Tilly, 54
Tocqueville, 588
Todt, 85
Toussenel, 298
Trauttmansdorff, 71, 352, 360
Treitschke, 536
Treumund Welp, see Pelz
Trieglaff, see Thadden-Trieglaff
Triersche Zeitung, 308
Truchsess-Waldburg, 11
Tschech, 306
Tscherning, 373
Turkey, Sultan of, see Abdul Medjid
Twesten, 100, 101, 102, 117
Tyssowski, 341

U.

UHDEN, 95, 105, 240, 363, 411, 412, 420, 423, 605
Uhland, 522
Uhlich, 97, 98, 108, 109, 110
Ullmann, 84, 113
Unzelmann, 165
Urff, 496
Uria-Sarachaja, Baron (Badenese, military officer), 73
Uria-Sarachaja (press censor in Baden), 509
Urquhart, 334
Usedom, 564
Ussing, 375, 377, 380

V.

VAN and van de (names beginning thus are indexed without prefix)
Varnhagen, 114, 176, 440, 586
Varnhagen, Rahel, see Rahel
Vasa, Prince of, see Gustavus
Vaterlandsblätter, see *Sächsische Vaterlandsblätter*
Veit, 453
Veit, Stoss, see Stoss
Venedey, 486
Verstolk van Soelen, 206
Viale Prela, see Prela
Vicari, 74, 75, 510
Victoria, Queen of England, 218, 276, 321, 322, 323, 416, 417, 528, 543, 544, 587
Vierteljahrsschrift, see *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift*
Vincke, Ernst Friedrich Georg, 412, 413, 438, 439, 441, 442, 443, 444, 448, 455, 457, 462, 464, 465, 466, 468, 511
Vincke, Friedrich Ludwig Wilhelm Philip, 6, 430, 439
Viollier, 329, 330
Vischer, Friedrich Theodor, 125, 183, 505
Vischer, Peter (the Elder), 54
Vischering, see Droste-Vischering
Vitruvius, 188
Vitus, Saint, 63
Vogel, 165
Volksspiegel, 312
Voltaire, 158, 170
von, von dem, von der (names beginning thus are indexed without prefix)
Vorwärts, 87, 132, 306, 598
Voss, 278
Vossische Zeitung, 140

W.

WAGNER, 149
Waitz, 385, 522
Waldburg, see Truchsess-Waldburg
Walpurga, Saint, 10
Waldemar IV, surnamed Atterdag, King of Denmark, 368
Wales, Prince of, see Albert Edward
Walewski, 337
Wallach, 426
Wallerstein, see Oettingen-Wallerstein
Wallwitz, see Nostitz-Wallwitz
Walter, 12
Wander, 313
Watt, 255
Watteau, 163
Watzdorff, 85
Wedell, 466
Wegener, 385, 600
Wegnern, 115
Wegscheider, 97, 98
Weidig, 495, 509, 518
Weidmann, 187
Weimar, see Saxe-Weimar
Weis, 33, 41
Weisbrod, 481
Weitling, 303, 306
Welcker, Carl Theodor, 67, 68, 69, 71, 428, 451, 495, 508, 509, 510, 512, 514, 552
Welcker, Friedrich Gottlieb, 189
Wellington, 257, 258, 322
Welp, see Pelz
Wentzel, 363, 365
Werner, 353, 532, 533
Werneuchen, see Schmidt
Wernher, 518

Werther, 6, 11, 25, 207, 212, 239
Wessenberg, 23, 76, 82
Westmoreland, 248, 250, 331, 357
Westphalen, 12, 500
Westphalische Dampfboot, 308
Weyer, 317
Wheatstone, 287
Widmann, 123
Wied, 463
Wielopolski, 364, 365
Wigard, 87
Wilibald, Saint, 10, 41
William, Duke of Brunswick, 211, 212, 217
William II, Elector of Hesse-Cassel, 492, 495, 496, 497
William I, King of the Netherlands and Grand Duke of Luxemburg, 205
William II, King of the Netherlands and Grand Duke of Luxemburg, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 211
William I, King of Würtemberg, 30, 36, 75, 112, 113, 232, 361, 432, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 534, 535
William, Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel, 370
William, Margrave of Baden, 72, 508
William, Prince of Prussia (the Elder), 271
William, Prince of Prussia (the Younger), 95, 96, 140, 241, 263, 323, 363, 402, 404, 406, 407, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 438, 440, 459, 461, 502, 515, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609
Willich, 401
Willisen, 599
Windischmann, Carl, 13
Windischmann, Friedrich, 13, 47, 63
Winter, 67, 511
Wippermann, 285, 522
Wiseman, 566
Wiser, 46
Wislicenus, 98, 99, 102, 108, 109
Witte, 216, 217, 267
Wittgenstein (Hesse-Darmstadt), 515
Wittgenstein, (Prussia), 5, 27
Wodiczka 458
Wolf, 188
Wolfenbüttel, see Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel
Wolff, 298
Wrangel, 394, 402, 408, 569
Wrede, Carl Philipp, 61
Wrede, Carl Theodor, 61, 62, 63, 487
Wurm, C. F. (of Hamburg, publicist), 215
Wurm (communist, cabinet maker of Warmbrumm), 312, 314
Würtemberg, Crown Prince of, see Charles
Würtemberg, Crown Princess of, see Olga
Würtemberg, King of, see William I
Würtemberg, Prince of, see Augustus
Wuttke, 88, 414

Y.

York, 311, 463
Yung, 308

Z.

Zamoyski, 337
Zeil, 76
Zeitschrift für Protestantismus und Kirche, 57
Zeitung, see *Allgemeine Zeitung*, *Deutsche Zeitung*, *Kölnische Zeitung*, *Triersche Zeitung*
Zeller, 190
Zenetti, 485
Zeschau, 92, 361
Zichy-Ferraris, see Metternich, Melanie
Ziegler, 574
Zieten, 168, 311, 463
Zimmermann, Carl, prelate, 55, 514
Ziska, 131
Zittel, 94, 509
Zollvereinsblatt, 223
Zu Rhein, see Rhein
Zuschauer, see *Deutsche Zuschauer*
Zwanziger, 311
Zwingli, 573, 579

Printed by Jarrold & Sons, Ltd., Norwich, England.